

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1961

The Senate met in executive session at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God, in the heat and burden of days that drain our strength and demand our best, we would find the springs by the wayside—the living water whose elixir alone can refresh and restore our bodies and spirits, saving us from physical exhaustion, from spiritual impoverishment, from the numbness of routine, and from all cynicism and bitterness of heart. Through the sincere expression of differing appraisals in this Chamber, may the final wisdom that charts the Nation's course in these perilous days be higher than our own.

Set our feet on lofty places,

Gird our lives that they may be  
Armored with all Christ-like graces  
In the fight to set men free.

Grant us wisdom, grant us courage,  
That we fail not man nor Thee.

Amen.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, and withdrawing the nomination of Earl W. Kintner, of Indiana, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner, which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 5188) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations; and

Executive E, 87th Congress, 1st session, the Convention on the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, together with two protocols relating thereto,

signed at Paris on December 14, 1960 (Ex. Rept. No. 1).

By Mr. PASTORE, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

Hickman Price, Jr., of Michigan, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce; and Robert T. Murphy, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Lee Loevinger, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Robert A. Bicks, resigned.

## NOMINATION OF NEVILLE MILLER FOR REAPPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, the nomination of Neville Miller for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is the Senate now in executive session?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is in executive session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## NOMINATION OF CHARLES M. MERIWETHER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Charles M. Meriwether to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PROXMIER in the chair). The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, is it in order to proceed to a discussion of the nomination before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon may speak on the nomination, which is before the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not speak at any great length this afternoon in respect to the Meriwether nomination. I have had enough experience in the Senate to know when a key vote has been cast. The key vote in respect to this nomination was cast yesterday afternoon when, by a vote

of 66 to 18, the Senate of the United States said, to all intents and purposes, "We do not propose to make a further investigation of this nominee, even though, since the committee hearings in respect to his nomination, some very serious charges have been presented to the Senate in regard to his qualifications both in respect to competency and character."

That is unfortunate. The Senate owed it to the President as well as to itself to pursue, in executive session of the committee, if necessary, a further inquiry into the character and qualifications or lack of qualifications of this nominee.

Mr. President, last night I received several calls from Alabama and many calls from other places, including the District of Columbia area, from those who wished to substantiate previous allegations which had been made to me, to which I referred on the floor of the Senate yesterday.

One Alabama newspaperman called to say that Admiral Crommelin should be subpoenaed to appear before the Senate committee, that he might come voluntarily but that he should be subpoenaed because, according to this newspaperman, if he were subpoenaed Crommelin would testify that Meriwether lied before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency when he tried to lead that committee to believe he had no part to play whatsoever in the 1954 campaign.

This editor, as the other editor to whom I referred in my speech yesterday did, said that Meriwether lied when he sought to leave the impression with the Senate Banking and Currency Committee that he was not aware of Shelton's Ku Klux Klan connections, and sought to leave the impression that he did not work with Shelton in Alabama politically in connection with the Patterson campaign.

I have had too many representations made to me that the nominee lacks veracity to fail to forewarn the Senate that the confirmation of the nomination, which I am sure will occur at 2 o'clock, will be the confirmation of the nomination of a man who, on the basis of character, does not deserve confirmation or deserve to serve in this administration.

In my judgment, the nomination will rise to plague the President of the United States. In my judgment, we do not help the President of the United States when we try to save him from his mistakes. But we have the duty to try to correct his mistakes. He has made a horrendous mistake in connection with this nomination, and the Senate is about to condone it.

Each of us must answer to himself as to his responsibilities under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution.

Because the question was brought into the debate yesterday, and I answered it briefly, I wish to comment at a little greater length today on the question as to whether or not, once this Senator becomes convinced that a nominee lacks the character that is called for by the character criterion under the advise and consent clause, I should ignore it,

and by rationalization, extend compassion and forgiveness.

There are many places where it is fitting to extend to a wrongdoer compassion, forgiveness, and charity. But it does not happen to be in connection with the oath to sustain the Constitution of the United States. To my sights, under that oath, once a Senator becomes convinced that a nominee does not meet the character test, he owes it to the people of the United States to do what he can to prevent the confirmation.

I have no right to substitute my compassion, my desire to forgive, my Christian charity, for my duty to vote against a man who, I am satisfied, does not meet the character qualifications called for under the advise and consent clause of the Constitution.

That is my position on that subject. I yield to no other Member of the Senate in respect to Christian compassion, charity, and forgiveness. But we have a senatorial duty to perform. We owe it to all the people of the United States to carry out that duty. They have the right to expect Senators to oppose and vote against a nominee who Senators believe lack the character that qualifies him for the job. I think I best serve my President when I carry out that duty.

Momentarily, the President is probably very unhappy about the fact that opposition has been raised to a nominee. At least when he made the nomination in the first place he probably thought it was an acceptable nomination. We can all conjecture what his second guess would be if he had a chance to make a second guess. But in my heart of hearts I shall always want to believe that if, at the time of the nomination, President Kennedy had known what the record now discloses, he would never have made the nomination. I have sat with him in the Senate and observed his actions in connection with nomination battles. On that basis, I am not justified in forming any other conclusion.

In my judgment, if Jack Kennedy were sitting in the Senate today, he would vote against the nomination if made by another President.

That is all conjecture. It is speculative. But that is my evaluation of the man based upon my association and experience with him.

The next point to which I wish to call attention by a little elaboration is the point I made yesterday, that Mr. Meriwether simply lacks the professional competency and the qualifications to do the highly technical and difficult job called for in the office of Director of the Export-Import Bank.

Senators will find on pages 3356 and 3357 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a listing of qualifications of the members of the Export-Import Bank immediately preceding January 1, 1960, and the present members of the Export-Import Bank. All one need do is to read their professional qualifications and then compare those qualifications with the vacuum of qualifications of Meriwether, and a comparison bespeaks what Senators' votes should be on the nomination.

This man has no qualifications of professional competency which qualify him to represent the American people in connection with lending billions of dollars which, over the years, will be available to the Export-Import Bank. Those dollars belong to the American people. Therefore we have the clear duty of seeing to it that our trustee has certain qualifications. In a sense, a Director of the Export-Import Bank is a trustee of the American people's money in that Bank.

Where are there any such qualifications in the nominee as we find in those of Samuel Waugh, the former chairman of the Board? Listen to some of his professional qualifications:

Director, Citizens' State Bank, Lincoln; trustee, University of Nebraska Foundation—

A financial foundation—member, American Bankers' Association (past president trust division).

There was a banker of experience. I say in all respect that the President of the United States should have considered the availability of qualified bankers for appointment to this job, and not merely the availability of one whose only qualifications are with the Crump machine in Tennessee, and political activities in the State of Alabama which reflect discredit on the nominee.

Let us take a look at the qualifications of Lynn Stambaugh:

Lawyer.

He practiced law for a good many years.

Served with Food Administration. Member of American Bar Association. Order of Coif Sigma Chi—

Which means that he was one of the top law students of his class; a brilliant mind. Compare those qualifications with the mediocrity of the nominee.

Consider Hawthorne Arey:

Banker. LL. B. cum laude.

He practiced in one of the strongest law firms in Omaha, Nebr.

He has had experience on the Reconstruction and Finance Corporation, Home Owners' Loan Corporation adviser to the U.S. delegation to the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference at Bretton Woods.

Here is a man who has had some experience in the field of foreign relations, so vital in the work of the Export-Import Bank.

Or let us take the man whom the nominee is supposed to replace, Mr. George Albert Blowers. General manager of the Bank of Monrovia, Liberia; Governor, State Bank of Ethiopia; Governor, Saudi Arabian Monetary Agency; participant in the International Food Conference and in the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference at Bretton Woods; International Monetary Fund and Bank of Savannah; Paris Peace Conference; representative at the first annual meeting of the International Monetary Fund and Bank, and also at the second meeting; deputy director of finance and trade, ECA; head of the United Nations Mission on Cur-

rency and Banking Problems to Libya; special adviser, International Monetary Fund.

This is the man whom Meriwether will replace. I am at a loss to understand how the President could make that trade. I put it mildly and am being very charitable when I say that the President's act is inexcusable. The American people were entitled to better. The record speaks for itself, if we turn to it. It shows the kind of members the bank has had during the preceding administration. The preceding administration made no such record in its appointments to the bank as this administration starts out with, with this nomination.

If we talk about charity, there is some charity in the fact that the other members of the bank may save him from some mistakes, that they may be his banking guardians while he serves on the bank, but so far as any innate competency and professional experience is concerned, "He just haint got it."

I am very sorry that there are those who are insensitive to the constitutional obligation to investigate the character of nominees that they give the impression that to consider the character criterion is to engage in unfair debate.

One of the things I wanted to get was an investigation of these matters, not on the floor of the Senate, but back in committee. I felt that if Crommelin were subpoenaed, if he did not wish to come voluntarily—although I understand he would—the committee could make a check on whether the Alabama newspaper editor was correct when he told me today that Meriwether lied when he sought to leave the impression with the Banking and Currency Committee that he had no connections whatever with Crommelin in the 1954 campaign, and that Meriwether lied when he sought to leave the impression with the committee that he had no connection with Shelton or the Ku Klux Klan.

The warning has been raised. I have no intention now, in view of the vote of yesterday afternoon, to press the matter further. I have made my record, as I made my record on Harold Talbott some years ago, when the Senate was confronted with pretty much the same sort of reaction. There was a great deal of criticism and questioning of his past record and his character.

I warned then that Talbott would rise to plague that administration. So will this nominee plague this administration. I quite agree with the editor of the Alabama newspaper who told me yesterday, "This man has no philosophy. This man is first, last, and always, a politician who plays with politics as a little boy plays with a toy erector set."

He went on to tell me that he believed this appointment was a disservice to Alabama. He called my attention to the fact that people in Alabama would like to have leaders in Alabama appointed to high positions in the administration, but they thought the administration, in view of the political service Alabama had performed for the administration—really to be frank about it—ought



to select leaders of Alabama who are recognized in the State for their competency, not for their ability at political manipulations and maneuvers.

The President has made his decision, and to all intents and purposes by its vote yesterday afternoon the Senate has made its decision. I shall abide by the results.

Certainly I shall be of assistance to the administration on other matters, reserving at all times, of course, my right and my duty to disagree with the administration whenever it presents what I think is such an inexcusable mistake as it has made on this nomination.

In regard to this matter, I close by saying I believe the President owes an apology to every Jew in America and to every Negro in America for this appointment, because in my judgment an investigation would show that the nominee is a racist and anti-Semitic. The President has no right to appoint such a person to a high position in his administration.

Mr. President, I received a telephone call today from a member of the State legislature in Alabama. He reported to me over the telephone the shock which exists among many of his colleagues in the legislature. They never thought the nomination would get anywhere in the Senate. They thought the Senate would make a careful investigation of some of this man's manipulations with respect to what he calls land deals in Alabama.

He told me over the telephone that this is why the nomination should be considered further by the Committee on Banking and Currency. He told me that a subcommittee of the House made some investigations with respect to certain land operations in Alabama and that a professional staff member of the House was scheduled to testify before the grand jury but received instructions denying him authority as an official of the committee to testify before the grand jury. He says it is well known that information which was available to the House has not been made available to the public, and that if the information were available it would reflect to the discredit of Meriwether.

I will not use the adjectives used by the member of the Alabama Legislature in describing the degree of Meriwether's integrity, but he made it very clear, in colorful language, that the nominee is considered to be a reprehensible crook, as evidenced by what would be disclosed if the Senate took the time, through its committee, a duty which it owes to the American people, to proceed with a thorough investigation of the complete lack of character of the nominee for the position to which he has been appointed.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said:

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the *RECORD*, following my statement about my telephone conversation with a member of the Alabama Legislature, charging that an investigation of Mr. Meriwether would show that he was guilty of dishonest conduct in connection with some land deal matters, certain newspaper articles involving that transaction.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

WASHINGTON.—Gov. John Patterson, of Alabama, who was cussing out Negro Congressman WILLIAM DAWSON, of Chicago, a short time ago for probing a highway scandal in Alabama, got mysterious and unexpected help overnight from that Negro.

The help took the form of a telegram received by an Alabama grand jury in Mobile then in the act of probing highly embarrassing highway charges that the Governor's former campaign manager, now finance director, was trying to increase a highway land appraisal from \$1 to \$180,000.

Governor Patterson had made statement after statement trying to belittle the probe, had even denounced the fact that a Negro Congressman in Washington, DAWSON, chairman of the House Government Operations Committee, was investigating the matter.

Then suddenly a mysterious telegram arrived from the Negro he had berated, aimed at rescuing the Governor.

What was so mysterious about the telegram was the fact that no one knew who really sent it. Congressman DAWSON's name was signed to it, but his secretary, Miss Norma O. Williams, said it had not cleared through her office. The clerk of the Government Operations Committee, Christine Davis, said it had not been sent through her office. The counsel of the committee, Orville Poland, knew nothing about it, nor did the assistant counsel, Robert Brown.

#### WHO SENT THE TELEGRAM?

Furthermore, the Congressman actually in charge of the investigation, Representative JOHN BLATNIK, of Minnesota, knew nothing about any telegram. He said that the committee's report was not yet typed, so that Chairman Dawson had had no chance to read it. Thus, the telegram was unwarranted. Furthermore the report, just brought back from Alabama by Committee Investigator Arthur Perlman, generally substantiated the charges made against Governor Patterson's finance director.

Despite this, the mysterious telegram signed by Chairman Dawson had reached the grand jury at 4:30 p.m., reading:

"There is not a scintilla of evidence in the land case. We washed our hands of this case on the floor of the House yesterday.

"WILLIAM L. DAWSON,

"Chairman, House Government Operations Committee."

Significantly the telegram left Washington at 3:58 p.m. Significantly it was broadcast over Station WKRG in Mobile at 4:01. This was almost 30 minutes before the wire reached the grand jury.

This led to further investigation in Washington.

An exposé in Mobile by an alert preacher who is also a member of the Alabama Legislature, Charles Trimmer, had prevented any loss. It was Trimmer's charges which were being sifted by the Mobile grand jury when the mysterious telegram arrived.

Meanwhile, Minnesota's BLATNIK, the Congressman in charge of the probe, spoke differently:

"We have investigated highway scandals in Nevada and many other States and received excellent State cooperation. In no other State have we had so much evasion and attempted coverup. From now on, every highway application received from the State of Alabama will be scrutinized by Congress. The public roads commissioner

will be required to send each application from Alabama to the Public Works Committee."

#### THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

Arthur Perlman, investigator of the Government Operations Committee which Congressman DAWSON, Chicago Democrat, heads, had gone to Alabama to investigate a smelly highway situation. Governor Patterson's campaign manager, now finance director, Charles Meriwether, had been charged with trying to increase the appraisal of a piece of Federal highway land from \$1 to \$180,000 in order to pay a political debt to another of the Governor's henchmen, Bill Delaney of Mobile. The Federal Government would pay 90 percent of the \$180,000; so Uncle Sam, in effect, would be paying off Patterson's friends.

The charge was made officially in the Alabama State Legislature by a preacher turned legislator, Charles Trimmer of Mobile.

When Investigator Perlman arrived in Alabama, he was received on Sunday, April 5, at the Governor's mansion in Montgomery and there questioned Charles Meriwether in the Governor's presence. The cross-examination continued from 4 to 6 p.m.

#### MYSTERIOUS PHONE CALL

The key question was whether Meriwether had telephoned Tom Cochran, one of the land appraisers, on February 8 to say that the State would not appeal if Delaney was awarded \$180,000 for the dumping of highway muck on his land.

Meriwether flatly denied making the phone call.

Two days later, Perlman was in mobile and asked Frank Drane, manager of the Admiral Semmes Hotel, for the record of Meriwether's phone calls on February 7 and 8. Drane hesitated, consulted his lawyer, finally produced them. The phone call records had been tampered with.

"Has anyone asked to see this record?" the congressional investigator asked.

Drane huddled with his attorney.

"Yes," he finally answered.

"Who?"

"Meriwether."

"When?"

"Sunday night at 8 p.m."

In other words, Meriwether had left the cross-examining session at the Governor's mansion at 6 p.m. Sunday in Montgomery and flown immediately to Mobile. It is 180 miles from Montgomery to Mobile. Perlman checked all commercial lines and found that Meriwether had not taken a commercial plane.

He must have taken a National Guard plane with, of course, the Governor's approval. Two National Guard planes had been sent to Mobile on the day of Preacher-Legislator Trimmer's charges in order to get alibi statements.

#### THE WASHINGTON MERRY-GO-ROUND

(By Drew Pearson)

Last week a northern Congressman, WILLIAM DAWSON, of Illinois, the senior Negro in Congress, went off to Chicago after either sending or authorizing a mysterious telegram aimed at influencing a grand jury in Alabama.

This grand jury was entrusted with digging into an important highway scandal. It did not seek advice from Washington, though it had sought the testimony of a congressional investigator sent to Alabama on behalf of the Government Operations Committee. He had brought back a report which bore out serious charges made against Gov. John Patterson's administration by State Representative Charles Trimmer in the Alabama Legislature.

But without waiting to read the report, though after consulting Congressman FRANK BOYKIN \* \* \* Chairman DAWSON either sent or authorized BOYKIN to send a telegram to the grand jury stating "There is not a scintilla of evidence in the land case. We washed our hands of this case on the floor of the House yesterday."

The telegram not only was untrue, but was couched in terms deliberately calculated to influence the jury. It is against the law to influence a grand jury in Alabama, as it is in most States.

To illustrate, here is what happened when the telegram was sent from Congress to Mobile at 3:58 p.m. on Thursday, April 16. Word of the telegram reached Congressman JOHN BLATNIK of Minnesota, chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Roads, on Friday, April 17, from Alabama State Representative Trimmer.

BLATNIK, who was in charge of the investigation, didn't know a thing about the telegram. He knew all about the investigation and should have been consulted. \* \* \*

When BLATNIK learned of the telegram, he tried to reach Chairman DAWSON but DAWSON had gone to Chicago. DAWSON's staff said they could not reach him.

Meanwhile the grand jury, meeting in Mobile, was nearing the end of its session. It was supposed to find for or against one of Governor Patterson's henchmen in a serious highway scandal. The jury had received a telegram from the chairman of a responsible committee of Congress saying there "was not a scintilla of evidence." Yet the jurors knew that the congressional investigator sent from Washington had found just the opposite.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. May I say to the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon that it is a matter of regret to me, as it is to him, to oppose this nomination, however, I feel it is my duty and an obligation to do so.

Later today, very regretfully, I shall vote, as will the distinguished Senator from Oregon, against confirmation of this nomination.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first, let me say to the Senator from Oregon, who has fought such a gallant fight here, that I think the country appreciates it. I really do. I think the Senate appreciates it. This matter had to be discussed. There was simply too much being said about it other than on the floor of the Senate. It was only fair that the subject should be aired, and in a considered way, before the country.

I may say also to the Senator from Oregon that when I went to the hearings, I hoped that we would have a repetition of the very situation about which the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] spoke yesterday. His words are very moving. I do not believe it is stretching anyone's imagination for a minute to believe that I would react in very much the same way, unless I were very much persuaded that this reaction was unjustified.

I went to the hearing on the Meriwether nomination hoping and praying that this was precisely how it would come out, that the witness would acquit himself in such a way that one could, at the conclusion of the hearing, make precisely the speech which the Senator from Illinois made yesterday: that,

surely, men make errors; men even deeply entertain thoughts and convictions which are erroneous; but the human personality is so magnificent, so divine, that it can get over anything; it can learn and relearn constantly through life.

Mr. President, I had my office ask the Senator from Illinois this morning if he would not be on the floor, because I wanted to talk precisely about what he had said, and to demonstrate my position from the record. I shall do that in a minute, although I agree with the Senator from Oregon that we have fought our fight, and the Senate has made pretty clear what it will do. Nevertheless, I thought the record, in fairness to the nominee and to the country, ought to be clear. The record itself shows that no such thing happened; that one who went to the hearing, hoping and praying, as I did, that this question would eventuate precisely as the Senator from Illinois thinks it has, had to come away compelled to this conclusion, by the testimony out of the mouth of the witness, whom no one subpoenaed.

This is no time to reargue the case, and I do not intend to do so. But in fairness to myself and all others who voted yesterday to send the nomination back to committee, there are two points which stand out in this whole matter. One was either the failure, the unwillingness, or the evasiveness to concede that this was a major issue. If a man does not recognize that a major issue in a campaign is the connection of the Klan with the campaign, is that man capable of being a representative of the United States in a position confirmed by the Senate? I should like the Senate—so much of it as is here—to follow me through this labyrinth. I shall start at page 12 of the hearing, where the witness was asked about the Klan connection. The date is very clear, I may say to the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]—May 15, 1958—when the issue was at its height, and the newspapers in Alabama, as I read into the Record yesterday, were publishing articles on the subject. The witness was asked:

Senator JAVITS. And it is a fact that it was a pretty hot issue; was it not?

Mr. MERIWETHER. Yes, sir; it was covered very extensively.

One would think that was very clear, until he turned back to page 11, only one page earlier, where the following occurred:

Senator JAVITS. And did you ask Shelton whether or not he was connected with the Ku Klux Klan in any way? Did you feel that was an important question in respect of your campaign?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir. The Ku Klux Klan was not an important question in respect to the Patterson campaign.

That was on page 11. But on page 12, Meriwether said:

Yes, sir; it was covered very extensively.

Let us see if he refreshed his recollection. We pass on, now, to pages 22 and 23. I read from page 22:

Senator JAVITS. Was it not a fact that the connection of Shelton and the Klan with the campaign was a big issue in Alabama?

Mr. MERIWETHER. No, sir, Senator.

Then, again, on page 23, the following occurred:

Senator JAVITS. You would confer with Shelton?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I did confer with him.

Senator JAVITS. And you knew at the time that you had these conferences about his position in the Klan, did you not?

Mr. MERIWETHER. I believe I said I am not sure. But I think I had been hearing the rumors.

Senator JAVITS. You say that you don't know—I did not quite get your answer to that. You don't know what the Klan stands for? Is that really so?

Mr. MERIWETHER. That is really so, sir.

Then he goes on to say:

The Klan issue was a very minor thing.

The statement was in the same answer.

So it was minor; it was major; and he really did not know what the Klan stood for.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] was certainly not an unfriendly questioner, and I respectfully submit that I was not either; I really tried to pursue the question objectively. When the Senator from Illinois then asked the witness the same question, I ask the Senate again to hear these responses which Meriwether made to the Senator from Illinois, who, as I say, was not an unfriendly questioner. I read from page 53 of the hearing:

Senator DOUGLAS. Mr. Meriwether, you have said that you have not previously publicly repudiated the doctrines of the Ku Klux Klan. I would now like to ask whether you are now prepared to repudiate them.

Mr. MERIWETHER. I am prepared, so, to repudiate anything that is not for our welfare. I do not really know what they are.

That was what Meriwether said about the Klan. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] seems to know, but Mr. Meriwether, who lived in Alabama and was in the campaign, and who testified on at least one occasion that it was a widely covered issue, said he did not know.

So the Senator from Illinois defined it for him. I read:

Senator DOUGLAS. May I be specific? The Ku Klux Klan is well known to be anti-Negro, anti-Semitic, and in the past anti-Catholic, and still in some places anti-Catholic. So I want to know whether you would be willing to repudiate the anti-Semitism of the Ku Klux Klan.

He takes Meriwether down the line from that point on.

I certainly agree with the golden words uttered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] yesterday. They are beautiful words. He said:

Let me say that we serve here not only as judges, but also as men of the world, and that in the world of justice there is a place for mercy and compassion. I do not wish to brand with disgrace a man who, I think, did make a mistake, and who perhaps persisted a little in that mistake. But I would say that we should not be unduly censorious; and I like to think of the fact that we should be charitable in the judgments we make, just as we hope the Lord will be charitable to us when we, with all our sins and inadequacies, face Him for final judgment. When we ourselves are involved in difficulties, we ask for ourselves not only justice, but also compassion and mercy; and



we believe that our friends should be accorded mercy and compassion. Why, then, should we deny mercy to men who have a differing point of view and who may err—and, I think, did err—but who did not err in a fashion so as to alter their fundamental loyalty to this Nation.

Mr. President, it is one thing to err; it is another thing to persist in error; it is yet a third thing not to know the difference as to whether one has erred or not. It seems to me that is what we have in this case. Here is a nominee who does not know the quality of the difference between what is and what is not fundamental loyalty to the basic principles of our Nation. He does not know what the Ku Klux Klan stands for. He does not know, although he said on one occasion he did, that it is a major issue in respect to the election of an American public official. Yet the Senate will today, as we surely know, put its imprimatur upon Meriwether as a person who is worthy to have his nomination confirmed for this office.

I cannot go along with that judgment. I respectfully submit that I have nothing but charity in my heart, and given the remotest chance, I would have voted to confirm the nomination of Mr. Meriwether if he had shown the remotest indication not only of error—I do not expect him to make a confession of all of the errors he has committed, but even the realization of the guilt of what he was engaged in and what it was all about. But that was absent.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I not only associate myself with the argument being made by the Senator from New York, but I shall always be very proud that my descendants will read this historic Record and know that I was associated with the Senator from New York, and that we took the position that the test of character ought to be carried out under the advise and consent clause; and that, in behalf of the American people, we had no right to exercise forgiveness in the sense that we would approve of the nomination of a man who does not meet the test of character, because the people's rights in this matter—not our own inner feelings of compassion—are what should prevail.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank my colleague for his graciousness and for his remarks.

Mr. President, I should like to conclude upon this note: As so often happens here, this is our last chance at the Meriwether nomination. Following the action that the Senate will take, he will be a confirmed high official of the U.S. Government, and what he says will be top news.

We shall act on this matter with our eyes wide open. I, too, have heard many of the things that the Senator from Oregon and other Senators have heard about what may be additional facts, what may be additional imperfections in the testimony, and what might have been proper to test if the nomination had been recommitted, as we so strongly urged yesterday. But all that is now academic. In order that the record may be clear, I respectfully submit that such matters

are neither too material nor too germane, because regardless of whether it can be proved that a man is a rascal, yet, as we know, under the law it is not necessary to prove more than a case.

It seems to me that the Senate cannot claim it is short of knowledge. The Senate is on notice as to precisely what are the ideological beliefs of the nominee. That is all the Senate needs to know. It is not necessary for Senators to go to extremes in this respect, because the Senate has to pass on the question of whether the nominee will be a good and an effective servant of the people, conducive to carrying on the policy of our country. When a nominee does not comprehend the basic elements of that policy, certainly he is not qualified to serve in such a public office. I repeat that such a situation is no discredit to a man as a father or as a resident of a State or as one who works for a living; but certainly the Senate must take heed of it and should not take action to confirm such a nomination, even though it is asked to do so, to an important Government position.

Mr. President, I am satisfied that the record has been made, and has been made fairly.

I shall vote, as I did yesterday, against confirmation. I shall do so in the deep conviction that such votes will represent not only the best interests of our country, but also a protest, at least by some, made out of deep conviction. I hope very much that our esteemed President and former colleague will look very carefully at the votes which will be cast on the question of confirmation of this nomination by Senators who will not be swayed from their clear judgment, not even during the honeymoon period of a new President who has done many auspicious things; and I hope very much that our votes will sound a note of caution that although this nomination may "get by" now, for whatever reason, yet such a situation must not continue and will not be tolerable either to the U.S. Government or to the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Long of Hawaii in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] and I explained this morning, in the greatest detail, our position on the nomination as we saw it. We explained the basic aspect of the case, which is that Mr. Meriwether cannot distinguish between what is important and what is unimportant and what effect beliefs like those of the Ku Klux Klan could have on his own position with respect to American policy. We felt the case was very fully proved with respect to his own qualifications.

I may say to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] that I read to the Senate the very moving words he uttered yesterday, and expressed my agreement with them. I said I hoped and prayed when I went to the hearings that the nominee would give us some aid and comfort by stating his own course, and that I would have been delighted had the hearing gone that way. Nothing would have pleased me better. But based on what the nominee said about his own convictions, or lack of them, or failure to do so, it was impossible for me to form any other judgment than that which I have formed.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I am sure that neither the Senator from New York nor the Senator from Oregon has the slightest touch of vindictiveness in him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, I wish to take this occasion to express my high regard for the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Robertson]. As chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, he has brought to the Senate floor for consideration many of the major Presidential appointments in the very short time which this administration has been in office. Moreover, the responsibility has fallen to him and to his committee to consider two of the most controversial of these appointments.

One is the appointment of Mr. Charles Meriwether, which is now before the Senate. It so happens that the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee has endorsed this appointment. In the previous case he did not. But the treatment of both appointees by his committee is comparable. Furthermore, in both instances the appointments have been brought to the Senate from the committee with equal and impartial dispatch. So once again, I express my respect and thanks to the Senator from Virginia for his leadership of the Committee on Banking and Currency in the handling of these difficult and delicate matters.

Mr. President, I shall support the majority recommendation of the Committee on Banking and Currency, which is to confirm Mr. Meriwether, even as I did in the case of the previous controversial appointment cleared by that committee.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Young of Ohio in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived; and, under the order of yesterday, the Senate will now proceed to vote on the question of advising and consenting to the nomination of Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, D.C.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUSH (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]. If the Senator from South Dakota were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. CAPEHART (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the able junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS]. If the Senator from Florida were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are absent on official business.

I further announce that the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] are necessarily absent.

On this vote, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BLAKLEY] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. CARROLL]. If present and voting, the Senator from Texas would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would vote "nay."

Mr. DIRKSEN. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROUTY] is absent by leave of the Senate because of illness.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] would vote "nay."

The pair of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has previously been announced.

The result was announced—yeas 67, nays 18, as follows:

[Ex. No. 1]

YEAS—67

Aiken	Ervin	McNamara
Allott	Fong	Monroney
Anderson	Fulbright	Morton
Bartlett	Gore	Moss
Beall	Hart	Mundt
Bennett	Hartke	Muskie
Bible	Hayden	Pastore
Boggs	Hickenlooper	Randolph
Bridges	Hickey	Robertson
Burdick	Hill	Russell
Butler	Holland	Saltonstall
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Schoeppel
Byrd, W. Va.	Humphrey	Smith, Mass.
Cannon	Jackson	Sparkman
Church	Johnston	Stennis
Cooper	Kefauver	Symington
Curtis	Kerr	Talmadge
Dirksen	Long, Mo.	Thurmond
Dodd	Long, Hawaii	Williams, Del.
Douglas	Long, La.	Yarborough
Eastland	Mansfield	Young, N. Dak.
Ellender	McClellan	
Engle	McGee	

#### NAYS—18

Case, N.J.	Javits	Proxmire
Chavez	Keating	Scott
Clark	Lautschie	Smith, Maine
Cotton	Miller	Wiley
Dworshak	Morse	Williams, N.J.
Goldwater	Neuberger	Young, Ohio

#### NOT VOTING—15

Blakley	Case, S. Dak.	McCarthy
Bush	Gruening	Metcalfe
Capehart	Jordan	Pell
Carlson	Kuchel	Prouty
Carroll	Magnuson	Smathers

So the nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the President will be notified forthwith.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, March 7, 1961, was dispensed with.

#### COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to sit during what period this afternoon is necessary for it to complete hearing the testimony of Secretary Ribicoff.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I shall not object, but I did want to make one observation. I try to accommodate Members of the Senate when they are going to be out of town and have no other time to cross-examine a witness; but I try, insofar as possible, to observe the rule when there is business on the Senate floor.

Mr. MORSE. Let me say to the Senator from Illinois that I agree with him. As he knows, I announced, after he left the Chamber, without mentioning anybody's objection, that the committee would not meet this afternoon. Then the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER] got in touch with the Senator from Illinois, because he cannot be here tomorrow and cannot be here until Monday, and he needed 30 minutes to ask questions, and he obtained the consent of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wanted to make clear that, whenever possible, we try to observe the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### REPORT OF ATTORNEY GENERAL UNDER DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report under the Defense Production Act of 1950, as of February 9, 1961 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### ESTABLISHMENT OF A JUNIOR COLLEGE DIVISION WITHIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TEACHERS COLLEGE

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the establishment of a Junior College Division within the District of Columbia Teachers College, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to let the temporary 1 cent per gallon Federal gasoline tax expire June 30, 1961, and to refuse to enact any increase in the Federal gasoline tax

"Whereas since the enactment in 1919 of the first State gasoline tax, this levy has been historically and rightfully a tax field particularly for the States; and

"Whereas South Dakota has imposed such a tax since 1921, which levy has been the principal source of revenue for State highway construction, maintenance, and supervision since such date; and

"Whereas in 1932 the Federal Government first imposed an excise tax on gasoline which was supposed to be a temporary emergency tax relief measure, but which has since been increased 300 percent and has now been set over as the principal source of revenue for the Federal highway trust fund; and

"Whereas the State and Federal gasoline tax combined averages more than 10 cents per gallon for the Nation as a whole, and amounts to a levy equivalent to substantially 50 percent of the average retail price of gasoline; and

"Whereas the Congress last year increased the Federal gasoline tax from 3 cents per gallon to 4 cents per gallon, such additional 1 cent, however, being only temporary and to expire June 30, 1961; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has recently suggested to the Congress of the United States that the Federal gasoline tax increase of said 1 cent per gallon be reenacted and another one-half cent per gallon be added, making the Federal gasoline tax 4½ cents per gallon; and

"Whereas such increase could have the effect of discouraging the use of motor vehicles and would thus have serious consequences for the economy as a whole as well as highway transportation, and could jeopardize the tourist travel which is so advantageous to the State of South Dakota, and also might jeopardize the national highway program by retarding the normal growth of highway tax revenues; and



"Whereas the Federal automotive excise taxes now imposed raised \$1½ billion in the last fiscal year above the Federal excise taxes dedicated to the Federal highway trust fund and is far in excess of any suggested future deficit which might occur in such highway trust fund: Now, therefore be it

*"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the South Dakota Legislature (the Senate concurring therein), That we respectfully request and memorialize the Congress of the United States to allow the temporary 1-cent increase to expire June 30, 1961, and to oppose any increase in the Federal gasoline tax; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the Members of Congress from the State of South Dakota are hereby urged and requested to oppose any such legislation to increase the Federal gasoline tax; and be it further*

*"Resolved, That the secretary of state transmit copies of this resolution to the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and to Hon. KARL MUNDT and Hon. FRANCIS CASE, Members of the U.S. Senate from South Dakota, and to Hon. E. Y. BERRY and Hon. BEN REIFEL, Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States from the State of South Dakota.*

*"Adopted by the house February 17, 1961.*

*"Concurred in by the senate March 1, 1961.*

*"CARL BURGESS,  
"Speaker of the House.  
"W. J. MATSON,  
"Chief Clerk of the House.  
"JOE E. BOTTUM,  
President of the Senate,  
Lieutenant Governor.  
"MILLS P. JENSEN,  
"Secretary of the Senate."*

#### PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE NATURAL GAS ACT—LETTER AND PETITION

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter and a petition from the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut, addressed to me on March 1, 1961, printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and petition, were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF CONNECTICUT,  
PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,  
Hartford, Conn., March 1, 1961.

The Honorable PRESCOTT BUSH,  
U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BUSH: Submitted herewith is a petition of the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut regarding enactment of proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE J. GRIFFIN,  
Executive Secretary.

PETITION OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT TO CONNECTICUT REPRESENTATIVES AND SENATORS IN CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE NATURAL GAS ACT

It appearing that regulation provided by the Natural Gas Act, and administration thereof, have been deficient in many respects. In particular, there is a large backlog of cases presently pending before the Federal Power Commission; rate increases are imposed upon consumers while reasonableness of former increases already in effect have not been determined by the Federal Power Commission; rate proceedings are protracted and extremely complicated; and patrons of Con-

necticut gas distribution companies have been subjected to a continuing spiral of higher cost of gas for the reason that Connecticut companies have been compelled to pay ever-increasing prices for gas purchased from transmission companies supplying this State; and

It appearing further that bills presently pending before the 87th Congress, namely, H.R. 2757, H.R. 2781, H.R. 4095, and S. 666 which have been referred to Committees on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, would amend the Natural Gas Act in order to remove many obstacles to efficient administration. Among other things, these amendments would outlaw indefinite pricing clauses in natural gas rates; the Federal Power Commission would be given authority to suspend proposed higher rates for gas sold for resale for industrial purposes; consecutive rate increases prior to demonstration of reasonableness of antecedent rate increases would be barred; and other procedural changes would be prescribed in order to expedite rate proceedings before the Federal Power Commission; and

It appearing further that the effect of the foregoing amendments would be to simplify rate structures, facilitate more prompt settlement of rate proceedings, and promote a measure of stability in rates paid by patrons of Connecticut gas distribution companies; and

It appearing further that the foregoing amendments to the Natural Gas Act would be of substantial benefit to all users of gas, including Connecticut patrons of gas distribution companies, for the reasons outlined above;

Now, therefore, we the undersigned, comprising the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Connecticut, petition and memorialize Connecticut Representatives and Senators in Congress that enactment of the foregoing proposed amendments to the Natural Gas Act should be supported in the interest of affording Connecticut residents the benefits of this fuel at reasonable cost.

We hereby direct that a copy of this petition be forwarded by the Secretary of this commission to each Connecticut Representative and Senator in Congress.

Dated at Hartford, Conn., this 1st day of March 1961.

PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION.  
EUGENE S. LOUGHLIN.  
HENRY B. STRONG.  
BASIL P. FITZPATRICK.

#### NEW YORK NURSERYMEN PROTEST GOVERNMENT REGULATION

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the New York State Nurserymen's Association has sent me a resolution concerning Government regulations on plant quarantines. It is the position of this organization that the projected extension of Government activity is neither necessary nor in the public interest. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The board of directors of the New York State Nurserymen's Association in executive session at Westbury, N.Y., on the 23d day of February 1961, without dissent resolves:

Whereas the directors of region V and region VI of the New York State Nurserymen's Association have indicated that it is the intent of the Plant Quarantine Branch of the Agricultural Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, to extend its present Japanese beetle quarantine to include those geographical areas in the State

of New York presently not under said quarantine regulations: Therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the said board of directors of the New York State Nurserymen's Association serving as the recognized representative of the nursery industry in the State of New York, urges the said agency of the Federal Government before making a pre-judgment to project said quarantine, to conscientiously and objectively consider the following:*

1. The absolute necessity of expending huge amounts of public money to perpetuate a regulatory function which is no longer in the public interest.

2. The duplication of a regulatory function which is presently being adequately administered and policed by the State of New York and which is recognized by all political subdivisions of government in the United States.

3. The creation of an additional economic burden upon the nursery industry in the State of New York which is experiencing severe economic competitive strangulation.

4. It is a factual conclusion that the nursery industry, statewide and nationally, with the utilization of agricultural chemicals is effectively controlling the dissemination of the Japanese beetle and other plant insects and diseases.

5. It is the judgment of recognized entomological research specialists affiliated with the agricultural experiment stations at Ithaca and Geneva, N.Y., that extension of this regulatory function will accrue no benefit from the standpoint of effective control and spread.

6. No data is a matter of record to indicate that nurseries presently are the realistic cause for dissemination of this insect.

7. No data is a matter of record to indicate that the population of the insect has materially changed in the last 10 years in the area of the State of New York under question.

8. There is no factual evidence by any regulatory agency to indicate the presence of the insect in commercial nurseries in the area under question; and be it further

*Resolved, That copies of this resolution be directed to the Secretary of Agriculture, U.S. Department of Agriculture; the Members of the congressional delegation from the State of New York; the chairman of the Agricultural Committee, the U.S. Senate; the chairman of the Agricultural Committee, the House of Representatives of the United States; the Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets, State of New York; the New York Conference Board of Farm Organizations, and the New York State Agricultural Businessmen's Council.*

#### RESOLUTION OF SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the School of Education of Syracuse University, favoring the repeal of the loyalty oath provisions of the National Defense Education Act.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION,  
SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Whereas the passage of the National Defense Education Act was wisely seen by the Congress of the United States of America as an important means to the necessary end of strengthening higher education in this Nation;

But whereas the praiseworthy purpose of this act and its practical application has been greatly frustrated by the inclusion of a disclaimer affidavit;

And inasmuch as the loyalty of freemen cannot be legislated, nor the disloyalty of those so inclined prevented or detected by such an affidavit: Therefore be it

*Resolved by the faculty of the School of Education of Syracuse University (in plenary session assembled),* That the Congress of the United States of America put the proper means to the right end of improving higher education by repealing the loyalty oath provisions of the National Defense Education Act; and be it further

*Resolved,* That copies of this be furnished to the appropriate educational and legislative officials, the better to make known the position of this faculty.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Res. 94. Resolution to provide for printing additional copies of Senate Report No. 29 for the use of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs (Rept. No. 62);

S. Res. 95. Resolution to print for the use of the Committee on Government Operations additional copies of Senate Document No. 113, 86th Congress, on scientific information (Rept. No. 63);

S. Res. 96. Resolution to provide for printing additional copies of Senate Report No. 29 for the use of the Committee on Public Works (Rept. No. 62);

S. Res. 99. Resolution to print the remarks of Senator Dobb at the Paris Conference on December 1, 1960, as a Senate document (Rept. No. 64); and

S. Res. 102. Resolution authorizing the printing of "Legislation on Foreign Relations With Explanatory Notes" as a Senate document (Rept. No. 65).

By Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, with an amendment:

S. Res. 86. Resolution to investigate matters pertaining to migratory labor (Rept. No. 66).

## EARL W. PRINCE—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 106) to pay a gratuity to Earl W. Prince, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Earl W. Prince, widower of June W. Prince, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

## AREA REDEVELOPMENT, 1961—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill—S. 1—to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas,

and I submit a report—No. 61—thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report, together with individual views, be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). The report will be received and printed, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1248. A bill to amend section 1732 (b) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the photographic reproduction of business records held in a custodial or fiduciary capacity and the introduction of the same in evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary. (See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1249. A bill to amend title V of the Housing Act of 1949 to assist in the provision of housing for domestic farm labor; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1250. A bill to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT (for himself and Mr. CASE of South Dakota):

S. 1251. A bill to provide for the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Lower Brule Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota (for himself and Mr. MUNDT):

S. 1252. A bill to provide for the payment for individual Indian and tribal lands of the Crow Creek Sioux Reservation in South Dakota, required by the United States for the Big Bend Dam and Reservoir project on the Missouri River, and for the rehabilitation, social and economic development of the members of the tribe, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1253. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation and facilities furnished or connected therewith; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1254. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1255. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1256. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; and

S. 1257. A bill to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1258. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1259. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition for voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration. (See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MCGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY):

S. 1260. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require the labeling of certain imported meats, poultry, and fish; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCGEE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1261. A bill to amend section 101 of title 38, United States Code, to provide certain death benefits for widows of Coast and Geodetic Survey commissioned officers who suffered service-connected deaths; and

S. 1262. A bill for the relief of Doris A. Reese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself and Mr. HRUSKA):

S. 1263. A bill for the relief of Marie Margaret Arvanetes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Hawaii:

S. 1264. A bill for the relief of Capt. Dale Frazier; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT:

S. 1265. A bill to amend section 2(3) of the National Labor Relations Act so as to extend the coverage of such act to members of the crews of certain fishing vessels; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. ENGLE:

S. 1266. A bill to transfer to the free list of the Tariff Act of 1930 bookbindings or covers imported by certain institutions; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BURDICK:

S.J. Res. 63. Joint resolution relating to the basis for computing the deduction for percentage depletion allowable to brick and



tile clay under the Internal Revenue Codes of 1954 and 1939 for taxable years beginning before 1961; to the Committee on Finance.

# CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

## PRINTING OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR CAPITOL" AS A SENATE DOCUMENT, WITH ADDITIONAL COPIES

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17), which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, the pamphlet entitled "Our Capitol"; and that three hundred twenty-three thousand five hundred additional copies shall be printed, of which one hundred three thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate and two hundred twenty thousand five hundred copies for the use of the House of Representatives.*

# RESOLUTION

## EARL W. PRINCE

Mr. MANSFIELD, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 106) to pay a gratuity to Earl W. Prince, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution, printed in full when reported by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

## AMENDMENT OF CODE RELATING TO PHOTOGRAPHIC REPRODUCTION AND USE OF CERTAIN BUSINESS RECORDS

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1732(b) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the photographic reproduction of business records held in a custodial or fiduciary capacity and the introduction of the same in evidence, and ask that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee.

Basically, this proposed legislation would remove from section 1732(b) of title 28 the exception relating to those documents held in a custodial or fiduciary capacity and, therefore, allow the reproduction and destruction of the originals to facilitate filing and storage in the ordinary course of business. A further effect of this amendment would be to allow the introduction of reproductions in evidence, whether or not the originals are in existence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1248) to amend section 1732(b) of title 28, United States Code, to permit the photographic reproduction of business records held in a custodial or fiduciary capacity and the introduction of the same in evidence, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

# U.S. ARTS FOUNDATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce at this time, for appropriate reference, a revision of my bill to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation to give some Federal recognition and aid by way of subvention to cultural endeavors in the American theater, music, and other arts.

I point out to my colleagues that this time I have included in the bill eligibility for the visual arts, in order to make the plan which I have conform, insofar as possible, to practices of the British Arts Council and the Canadian Arts Council, which I think are particularly analogous to the action we ought to take in this country.

Mr. President, the United States is probably the only major country in the world now which does not do something about this very critical matter of cultural and artistic development in the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1250) to establish the U.S. Arts Foundation, introduced by Mr. JAVITS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks letters of endorsement for this proposed legislation from Mr. Erich Leinsdorf, music consultant of the Metropolitan Opera; Rise Stevens, a great operatic soprano; and a very old friend of mine who is interested in the arts in New York, Mr. Symon Gould, director of the Film Guild.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## METROPOLITAN OPERA,

New York, N.Y., February 21, 1961.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,  
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Returning from my tour with the Boston Symphony, it has been pointed out to me that you introduced a bill in Congress to establish a U.S. Arts Foundation to promote the study and advancement of the performing arts.

May I congratulate you on this most commendable and very necessary initiative? If there is anything I can do in the form of assistance or active advice, I would be more than delighted to help.

Sincerely,

ERICH LEINSDORF.

## METROPOLITAN OPERA,

New York, N.Y., February 21, 1961.

Senator JACOB K. JAVITS,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: I would like to express my heartfelt support for your efforts toward the establishment of a U.S. Arts Foundation. Word reached me on tour in Hawaii concerning the bill you were planning to introduce in the Senate. I am deeply interested to know that you feel that the Congress is "at long last on the verge of recognizing" that our Government has a responsibility toward the performing arts and that you are planning to implement that responsibility in tangible form.

Taking advantage of a brief stay at home, I wish to tell you how enthusiastic I am about your action which at last shows the

way toward the entry of our Government into the fields of music and theater.

I would welcome the opportunity to be of help to you in any way.

Sincerely yours,

RISE STEVENS.

## FILM GUILD,

New York, N.Y., February 9, 1961.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,  
New York City.

DEAR JACK: Assuredly you are to be commended to find time in your ultraoccupied career to foster interest and sponsor aesthetically progressive legislation looking toward the establishment of a long-deferred Arts Foundation which our country should undeniably support.

While it is true that present emergencies require a concentrated attention on conditions which affect the economic, social, and virtual survival status of our Nation, nevertheless the eternal life of a people are inextricably bound up with its intellectual and artistic qualities which are both a generative and a regenerative power.

One might indulge in the cliché that long after our diplomats, politicians and aye, even Senators (please forgive) are long forgotten, the poets, playwrights, and authors are eternally remembered, at least the good ones.

There is no doubt that the theater is and can become a vital force in the life of our Nation, pointing the way to a higher idealism and stirring both the patriotism and thinking elements of our folk and rousing them to a degree where it can become a major influence in preserving our cherished ideals and liberties against the threats of ideologies that seek to displace them.

In addition, the cinema must also be counted upon to have that projecting power and influence on the higher level of production, not of course the run-of-the-mill commercial output. Therefore, I submit that any Arts Foundation that you propose should embody these twin arts which are basically related in their artistic and aesthetic milieu.

As you know, I am the "father" of the art cinema movement in this country, and I would be happy to consult with you in framing your proposed legislation so that proper recognition may be made to include the cinema in its essentials because while the theater is unfortunately confined to the major urban centers, the film reaches the smallest hamlets and thereby can and should exert a major influence in the aesthetic life of our people if the persons and groups dedicated to elevating film standards receive proper recognition and support.

Sincerely yours,

SYMON GOULD,  
Director.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very accurate report of my interview in regard to this bill, from the publication Back Stage.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Back Stage, Feb. 17, 1961]

CLIMATE RIGHT FOR FEDERAL AND STATE AID TO THE ARTS—KENNEDY AND ROCKEFELLER IN RECEPTIVE MOODS

Now is the time for all good governments to come to the aid of their culture.

According to Senator JACOB K. JAVITS, Republican, of New York, "the climate has never been better in the country for the people and their elected representatives to finally accept the fact that we have a culture in America and we should do something to aid in its development."

Senator JAVITS introduced in the Senate Monday, February 13, legislation to establish a United States Arts Foundation to promote the study and the advancement of the performing arts throughout the United States.

At a press conference held at Actors Equity in New York City, Senator JAVITS said that he has been trying to get Federal recognition of the arts since 1949, but this is the first year he is reasonably confident that such legislation can be passed since "it is now the most strategic moment. We have a new, forward-looking President who is inclined to look upon the arts with favor. We have the British and Canadian Arts Councils to serve as examples. We have States, especially New York State, lending an open ear."

After the press conference, Senator JAVITS told Allen Zwerdling, publisher of *Back Stage*, that one of the main blocks to previous legislation introduced in the House, Representative Barden, of North Carolina, no longer heads the Committee on Labor and Education. Representative Barden pigeonholed nearly all such bills in the past but the new head of the committee is Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, of New York, who is expected to move all such bills along quickly. More liberal committee heads in both Houses of Congress are now receptive to legislation aiding the arts and a mail campaign could convince the recalcitrants.

#### MAIL CAMPAIGN

Senator JAVITS emphasized that a mail campaign is needed and he urged interested individuals and organizations all over the country to write their own Senators expressing their approval of his bill which will be referred to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Senator JAVITS also explained that his bill was actually a conservative one, calling for no more than \$10 million a year for the entire country (compared to \$100 million allocated in Canada), but he felt that it was important to get the Government to at least recognize officially that the United States has a culture. Under the JAVITS bill there can be no fear of Government domination of the arts since the Government will not of hiring any performers or building theaters or museums. "Actually," said the Senator, "the Government will just be a partner with the people in supporting nonprofit projects. If the people do not respond at the box office, the projects will fold since they cannot depend solely on Government aid."

#### EXAMPLE OF PROGRAM

Pressed to give one example of how the program might work, Senator JAVITS cited the hypothetical case of an established, recognized nonprofit group that wanted to do a series of Shakespearean plays but found that they lost \$50,000 doing it in the past over a 10-week period. The Government board would examine the project, check the expenses, cost of production, and expected box office returns. It would then guarantee to make up part of the expected loss, say \$25,000 to \$35,000, forcing the group to expand efforts to increase their intake at the box office, but also guaranteeing the loss would not be disastrous. As the Senator explained, this is a rough idea of how one project could work.

Details of the bill call for the appointment of a Director and a Board of Trustees comprised of 12 private citizens appointed by the President to serve 6-year terms to operate the U.S. Art Foundation which during its first year would operate on a budget not to exceed \$5 million during its first year, and \$10 million annually thereafter.

#### FUNCTIONS OF FOUNDATION

The U.S. Arts Foundation would be authorized to—

1. Provide financial assistance to nonprofit groups engaged in the performing arts

including theatrical and musical performances, opera, dance, ballet and choral recitals, and to encourage such presentations in all parts of the United States;

2. Cooperate, assist, and sponsor international activities relating to the performing arts in consultation with the State Department, including the sponsorship of performances abroad;

3. Establish and maintain registers of personnel and theaters in the performing arts;

4. Foster and encourage civic and nonprofit private and public educational institutions or Government groups directly concerned with performing arts;

5. Conduct surveys of these performing arts.

Senator JAVITS said, "At long last, Congress is on the verge of recognizing that the Federal Government has a responsibility toward the performing arts in our Nation that it can best fulfill in the role of a stimulator and coordinator of the artistic and cultural resources of the United States. New York now has a State program under the direction of the New York State Council on the Arts, set up under State law, to encourage the arts. President Kennedy has evidenced his interest in such a program for the United States and, in fact, the 1960 Democratic Party platform proposed a Federal advisory agency to assist the expansion of our cultural resources. New York City and other municipalities are helping the arts. In Congress, the number of bills already introduced for this purpose since the beginning of this session is additional evidence of likely congressional action in this field."

#### MODEST APPROPRIATION

"The U.S. Arts Foundation functioning on a modest appropriation of a few million a year spent in conjunction with matching funds of other interested public or private agencies, could stimulate as much as \$50 million in non-Government activity on behalf of our performing arts. I believe that national legislators are expressing heightened interest in such a proposal because of the marked increase in cultural activity at local and State levels. It's been impressed upon them that a majority of the American people no longer view the performing arts merely as a fringe benefit of modern living squeezed into the entertainment category. We are coming to realize that cultural pursuits are not a luxury but a necessity in our free society as it continues to grow and develop in this space age. While our space missiles and satellites will continue to make headlines abroad, U.S. prestige abroad received enormous benefits from the cultural exchange agreements and foreign tours by American artists like Helen Hayes, Marian Anderson, Van Cliburn, and Louis Armstrong long before Discoverer I ever went into orbit, and it will continue to do so."

"The legitimate expansion of Federal activity in many social and economic spheres in recent years has paved the way now for the Government to develop a partnership concept to help advance the arts through aiding local organizations and sending live performances into areas which otherwise would not receive them. As yet, a television set is no substitute for a family excursion to the theater or a concert or the ballet."

"Nor is the desire to advance the arts through governmental participation new. In 1891 Congress established the National Conservatory of Music, which brought Anton Dvorak to this country; it was this American experience which inspired him to compose the *New World Symphony*."

#### ANTA A FIRST STEP

"In 1935 the American National Theater and Academy (ANTA) was chartered by Congress. Although its growth was seriously hampered by the coming of the war and by lack of funds, it is now directing with great

success our international efforts in the field of music and the theater under the auspices of the State Department. In recent years, Congress established the permanent program of cultural exchange with other nations, granted a Federal charter to the National Music Council, and established a National Cultural Center in Washington, D.C."

"Recognition of America's need for frequent performances of theatrical and other works in all parts of our Nation and of the people's unabated desire for such performances prompted me in 1949 to introduce, while a Member of the House of Representatives, a resolution looking toward the establishment of an American National Theater and an American National Opera and Ballet. My present proposal is closely analogous to the British and Canadian Arts Councils which have done so much in their countries to stimulate the performing arts. It is my earnest hope that the present Congress will take cognizance of America's needs for an active and expanded cultural life—a need which this bill attempts to meet."

#### DONATIONS ACCEPTED

"The foundation is authorized to accept donations, collect admission charges and utilize the services of volunteers, so that a minimum of appropriated funds would be required. It would have an appropriate number of committees composed of professional people and the general public covering the various aspects of the performing arts to remove any danger of uniformity due to governmental assistance. The panels would judge the artistic worth and cultural significance of works to be presented to determine if they are worthy of support by the foundation."

"An organization functioning in this manner makes baseless the fear of governmental control of the arts and its relatively small cost should cause little anxiety about the level of governmental expenditures. This is indeed one case where a drop in the bucket can help quench the cultural thirst of 180 million people."

"I believe the United States Arts Foundation can enable us to look forward to the day when our Nation will be served by theater, opera, ballet and music available in all sections of our land—so that no populated place is culturally starved—and the world will honor us for it. The soul of America will in this way be enabled to grow in keeping with the growth of our productive capabilities."

#### LABELING OF CERTAIN IMPORTED MEATS, POULTRY, AND FISH

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, many of us have been concerned about the problem involving labeling of imported meats. We have received many letters from individuals—housewives in particular—who have purchased unlabeled meats in markets around the country, telling about meat which had been frozen and imported, which later turned out to possess an unhealthy condition or to lack quality, of which the purchaser was not aware.

In order to correct this condition, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of my colleague from Wyoming [Mr. Hickey] and myself, a bill which would amend the Federal Food and Drug Act to correct the condition which now obtains.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.



The bill (S. 1260) to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, as amended, to require the labeling of certain imported meats, poultry, and fish, introduced by Mr. McGEE (for himself and Mr. HICKEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### PROGRAM TO ALLEVIATE CONDITIONS OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN CERTAIN DISTRESSED AREAS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUSH submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1) to establish an effective program to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in certain economically distressed areas, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. CAPEHART submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1, *supra*, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### SPECIAL PROGRAM FOR FEED GRAINS FOR 1961—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 993) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. AIKEN submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 993, *supra*, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. COOPER submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 993, *supra*, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ADDITIONAL PENALTIES FOR PERSONS CONVICTED OF VIOLATING THE ANTITRUST LAWS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 996 to amend the Sherman Act to provide additional public relief from repetitive criminal violations of the antitrust laws, and for other purposes, which is my proposed antitrust amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me, I should like to join as a cosponsor of the amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Oregon may be added as a cosponsor. I am grateful and proud to have his cosponsorship of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT RELATING TO QUALIFICATION OF ELECTORS—ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate of February 28 and March 3, 1961, the names of Senators AIKEN, ALLOTT, ANDERSON, BARTLETT, BEALL, BENNETT, BIBLE, BOGGS, BRIDGES, BURDICK, BUSH, BUTLER, BYRD of West Virginia, CANNON, CAPEHART, CARLSON, CASE of New Jersey, CHAVEZ, CHURCH, COOPER, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, DODD, ENGLE, FONG, GRUENING, HARTKE, HAYDEN, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, JACKSON, KEATING, KERR, LAUSCHE, LONG of Hawaii, LONG of Missouri, MANSFIELD, McGEE, METCALF, MORSE, MORTON, MOSS, MUSKIE, NEUBERGER, PASTORE, PELL, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, SALTONSTALL, SCHOEPPLE, SCOTT, SYMINGTON, WILEY, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, WILLIAMS of Delaware, YOUNG of North Dakota, and YOUNG of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to the qualifications of electors, introduced by Mr. HOLLAND (for himself and other Senators) on February 28, 1961.

#### FEDERAL LIENS, PRIORITIES, AND PROCEDURES ACT OF 1961—ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of March 3, 1961, the name of Mr. BUTLER was added as an additional cosponsor of the bill (S. 1193) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the priority and effect of Federal tax liens and levies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. CURTIS (for himself and other Senators) on March 3, 1961.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 5188) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### By Mr. WILEY:

Address by the Honorable THOMAS B. CURTIS, Representative in Congress from the State of Missouri, before the Federal Supply Management Association, Washington, D.C., February 7, 1961.

#### DEATH OF REPRESENTATIVE W. F. NORRELL OF ARKANSAS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, all of us were saddened by the untimely death of Representative Norrell, of Arkansas. A great loss has been suffered

in his passing. The Sixth District of Arkansas, the State of Arkansas, and the Nation have benefited from his outstanding and distinguished career. The imprint of his works in the public service will be a lasting memorial.

Bill Norrell was elected to the Arkansas State Senate in 1931 and was reelected in 1935. He served as president of the senate from 1933 to 1937, during which time he served on several occasions as Acting Governor. He was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1938 and served for many years as a member of the Committee on Appropriations. At the time of his death he was a ranking member of that committee. He served as chairman of the Legislative Appropriations Subcommittee and as a member of various subcommittees, including the important Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations and the Subcommittee on Interior Appropriations.

All of those who knew Bill Norrell admired and respected him for his integrity, his ability, and his sincerity. He was a man of his word. He was kind, gracious, and humble.

I treasured and will always remember the friendship of Bill Norrell.

An unknown author has portrayed his life:

Beautiful life is that whose span is spent in duty to God and man;  
Beautiful calm when the course is run,  
Beautiful twilight at the set of sun,  
Beautiful death with a life well done.

Mr. Fulbright and I extend our sincere and heartfelt sympathy to Catherine Norrell and Judy in their bereavement.

#### JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, for the past year or more I have been deeply concerned about the increased membership and spreading influence of a relatively new organization called the John Birch Society.

It has gained considerable membership in several of the major cities in North Dakota. In one city alone, it has at least four cells. This organization is ultraconservative in nature and has among its members some of the most able and influential people in each community. Strangely enough, most of its criticism is leveled, not against liberal public officials, but against the more middle-of-the-road, and even conservative, Republicans.

They have accused me of being about every kind of a scoundrel, including a Communist or pro-Communist. This gives me little concern, as I am certain no sane person would believe there is the slightest substance to such a charge. In fact, from a practical political point of view, such charges actually are of some help. It is a sort of medicine to some liberal thinking people who have often accused me of being a reactionary conservative.

I have been aware for a long while that the head of this organization, Mr. Robert Welch, has made accusations against the President of the United

States and other top officials far beyond anything the late Senator Joe McCarthy ever thought of. I quote a part of a story appearing in the Chicago Daily News of July 26, 1960:

However, new members are not told about a book written by Welch. Its title is "The Politician." It is about President Eisenhower, and for 302 pages tries to prove that the President is a conscious, dedicated agent of the Communists.

It maintains that the present administration is controlled by the Communist Party.

In this fantastic document Milton Eisenhower is described as Ike's superior in the Communist Party. Even Neil McElroy, former Secretary of Defense, is pilloried as "doing the Communists' work for them with assurance and determination."

Mr. President, I hesitated to give further publicity to this dastardly attack. It is unbelievable that any sane person would make such accusations against President Eisenhower, who has devoted his life to the service of this country and who led all of the allied forces in the European theater during World War II. The only reason why I am reluctantly giving publicity to the vicious charges made by the leaders of this society is that I believe it will serve to give needed information to people in my State and elsewhere who may be influenced by this organization.

Communism represents a serious menace to freedom-loving people everywhere. It is the same international conspiracy it has always been, seeking to enslave the entire free world. To label some of our most loyal and dedicated people as Communists plays right into the hands of the Communist movement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an article appearing in the Chicago Daily News under date of July 26, 1960, entitled "Strange Threat to Democracy," and also an article appearing in this week's issue of Time magazine, entitled "The Americanists."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Daily News, July 26, 1960]

#### STRANGE THREAT TO DEMOCRACY—ANTI-RED GROUP HITS LEADERS

(By Jack Mabley)

Robert Welch, the leader of thousands of conservative Americans in the John Birch Society, not only believes that President Eisenhower is a Communist, but he takes a dim view of democracy.

"Democracy is merely a deceptive phrase, a weapon of demagoguery, and a perennial fraud," he told founders of the John Birch League in 1958. He has continued to maintain this in a booklet given to new members.

Welch, a prominent Boston businessman, a former board member of the National Association of Manufacturers, has 25 lines of biography in "Who's Who in the East."

He is the absolute boss, the authoritarian head of the John Birch Society, which ostensibly is an organization dedicated to fighting communism.

This league has thousands of members throughout the country, and a goal of a million members.

Wealthy conservatives support Welch. He lists as members of the advisory council, Cola G. Parker, Ernest G. Swigert, and William J. Grede, all past presidents of the National Association of Manufacturers, Clarence Manion of the Manion Forum, the late James Simpson, Jr., former Illinois Republican Congressman, and a number of other well-known conservatives.

#### LOFTY AIMS ARE MOST ATTRACTIVE

Welch is a persuasive speaker. Many responsible people are attracted to the Birch Society by the lofty aims expressed by Welch and "coordinators" who lead local groups.

It is made clear to new members that the organization is monolithic, that it operates under complete authoritative controls at all levels. And Welch is the undisputed boss.

However, new members are not told about a book written by Welch. Its title is "The Politician." It is about President Eisenhower, and for 302 pages tries to prove that the President is a conscious, dedicated agent of the Communists.

It maintains that the present administration is controlled by the Communist Party.

In this fantastic document Milton Eisenhower is described as Ike's superior in the Communist Party. Even Neil McElroy, former Secretary of Defense, is pilloried as "doing the Communists' work for them with assurance and determination."

This book is supposed to be seen only by leaders of the society. Recently a meeting in Glenview was disrupted when the book was brought up in open discussion by someone in the audience.

Stillwell J. Conner, leader of the meeting, had told a member that giving the book to a member of the society before he became "qualified" was like telling a first-year medical student to go out and cure cancer.

#### ROOSEVELT, H.S.T. USED BY COMMIES

Welch writes that Roosevelt was used by the Communists. He says that Truman also was used by them, but with his knowledge and acquiescence because "they made him President." In the third stage of the Communist conspiracy, writes Welch, "the Communists have one of their own actually in the Presidency."

It may be questionable judgment to give these incredible statements the dignity of publicity. But Welch is persuasive.

Quietly he has been gaining strong support among both prominent conservatives and thousands of ordinary people who seek to fight communism.

They should know the thinking of the man to whom they are pledging their energies and loyalty.

[From Time magazine, Mar. 10, 1961]

#### ORGANIZATIONS

##### THE AMERICANISTS

Among the U.S. brotherhoods dedicated to the fight against communism, nothing is quite like the John Birch Society. Except for an elite corps of leaders its members shun personal publicity and their names are held by the society in strictest secrecy. Its cells, of 20 to 30 members apiece, take orders from society headquarters, promote Communist-style front organizations that do not use the John Birch name. Carefully avoiding normal channels of political action, the society accepts the hard-boiled dictatorial direction of one man who sees democracy as a "perennial fraud" and estimates that the United States is 40 percent to 60 percent Communist controlled. In other times, other places, the John Birch "Americanists"—as they call themselves—might seem a tiresome, comic-opera joke. But already the society admits to cells in 35 States, and its partisans have made their anonymous and unsettling presence felt in scores of U.S. communities.

In Wichita, Kans., student members of the society are trained to tell their cell leader of any "Communist" influence noted in classroom lectures; by phone, parents belabor the offending teacher and his principal for apologies and admissions of guilt. A Wichita businessman who planned to make a modest contribution to a University of Wichita fund was dissuaded because members of the society were demanding that certain professors and books be thrown out. "My business would be wrecked," said he, "if those people got on the phone and kept on yelling that I am a Communist because I give money to the school." Society members in Nashville, Tenn., started telephone campaigns to warn homeowners that some of their neighbors were suspected Reds. The project with current top priority is the impeachment of Chief Justice Earl Warren, and activities in a dozen cities range from the "spontaneous" circulation of petitions to a rash of letters to newspapers, and a "Help Impeach Earl Warren" banner strung across the main street of Pampa, Tex. (and taken down by the police a few hours later).

#### The Red plot

All society activity comes under the firm thumb of a balding, deceptively mild-mannered, retired businessman from Belmont, Mass., named Robert Welch. Son of a North Carolina farmer, Baptist Welch, 61, spent 25 years as an executive with Cambridge's famed candymaking James O. Welch Co. (run by his brother). After the war, Welch began to bone up on Communist literature; eventually he decided that such schemes as social security and Federal income tax laws were part of a Red plot to ready the United States for Soviet conquest. Welch left candy for full-time anti-Communist pamphleteering in 1957. He founded the John Birch Society the next year, naming it for a U.S. Navy captain killed by Chinese Communist guerrillas after V-J Day.

Welch's Mein Kampf is a masterpiece of invective called "The Politician." Shown only to close friends, the book is now being withdrawn from circulation, largely because its judgments on contemporary leaders repelled more people than they attracted. Some Welchian estimates:

The Eisenhower brothers: "Milton Eisenhower is actually Dwight Eisenhower's superior and boss within the Communist Party. \* \* \* For [the former President] there is only one possible word to describe his purposes and his actions. The word is 'treason.'"

CIA Director Allen Dulles: "The most protected and untouchable supporter of communism, next to Eisenhower himself, in Washington."

The late John Foster Dulles: "A Communist agent."

#### Rightwing names

For public consumption, Welch has kept his vitriol well enough in check to avoid libel suits. A prolific author, he has turned out reams of Red-baiting copy, including the Blue Book that guides the society's actions. He puts out the monthly American Opinion, as well as a bulletin that informs all dues-paying (\$24 a year for men, \$12 for women) members of the society's monthly aims. Despite the ill fame of "The Politician," Welch has been highly praised as a freedom fighter by a horde of familiar rightwing names, e.g., Actor Adolphe Menjou, Lawyer Clarence Manion, ex-Diplomat Spruille Braden, who grace the society's council and have the right to appoint his successor.

Not all conservatives are so sanguine about Welch. Many object to the society's contempt for dissent from its views, feel that its militant words and thoughts are barely a goosetep away from the formation of goon squads. "This is the kind of thing that



does violence to everything we're trying to accomplish," says one Chicago conservative who backed away from Birchism after a glimpse at "The Politician." It siphons a lot of well-meaning, respectable people off into a lunatic fringe run by Welch, at the same time giving anti-Communist efforts a black eye. It hurts us much more than it helps us."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am glad the distinguished Senator from North Dakota has brought this matter up, because the same thing is happening in the State of Montana. I have been trying to get some information as to what the John Birch Society is, and I cannot seem to get any help from various committees here or the agencies downtown.

Certainly, when any organization accuses a President of the United States, a man who has served with such distinction as has General Eisenhower, I think something is wrong somewhere and that something ought to be done to lay the facts before the American people so they can judge this organization for what it is. I never heard of it. I do not know who John Birch is. But there is a John Birch Society which apparently is operating in Montana and the Dakotas.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished majority leader. According to the issue of Time magazine which has come out today, this organization has active cells in more than 35 States and has grown to a considerable membership.

#### THOMAS GARRIGUE MASARYK (1850-1937)

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the late Thomas Masaryk, of Czechoslovakia, was one of the great statesmen of this century, and perhaps the greatest Czechoslovak statesman in modern times. He was respected among his own people, and in all of Europe, as a dedicated champion of liberty and democracy. He was usually thought of as a philosopher-statesman, but he was more than that. He was, in addition, a great teacher, a great editor, a distinguished parliamentarian, and an eminent man of letters. Above all, he was a great and indefatigable fighter for the Czechoslovak cause, for the freedom of his people. On the 111th anniversary of his birth, he is remembered as the founding father and the first President of the Czechoslovakian Republic. We honor the memory of this champion of freedom, this dauntless fighter for the cause of humanity.

#### AMERIGO VESPUCCI (1451-1512)

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, in the history of the discovery of America two Italians played key roles. Christopher Columbus discovered the continent, but Amerigo Vespucci gave it his name.

The adventurous and daring son of a notary in Florence, Amerigo Vespucci possessed a lively interest in geography. He was anxious to see and explore the unknown parts of the world. As a clerk, and later as a representative of the famous Medici merchants, he had sailed and seen much of the then-known world. By about 1500 he was determined to push his explorations beyond the known parts of the globe.

He transferred his services to Don Manuel of Portugal, and under his patronage organized several expeditions to the New World. On one of these he is reported to have reached the Canaries and Cape Canaveral, Fla. Then he sailed south and touched the coast of Brazil. Since he had sailed the coasts of both North and South America, his name was given to both continents. On the 510th anniversary of his birthday, we honor the memory of this great navigator and explorer, Amerigo Vespucci.

#### SIGNS OF ECONOMIC UPTURN—THE BETTER HOME FURNISHINGS COUNCIL OF GREATER CHICAGO

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I note from this morning's press that Dr. Heller, economic adviser to the President, has detected "signs of an upturn." He does, however, lament the slack between actual production and our capacity to produce.

Despite this qualification by Dr. Heller, it may be that the crying towel is about to go into the discard and that the kind of an affirmative, positive note which a nation needs at a time like this will be emphasized instead of the gloom-doom accent which it has heretofore received.

It is encouraging to note that there are great numbers of American business leaders who are determined to make the coming decade the most prosperous that the people of this country have ever enjoyed.

Their zeal and determination are notable and are certainly evident in many sections of the land.

I should like to make specific mention of just one of these groups of dedicated business leaders in my own State of Illinois. I mention them only because they are representative of thousands of such groups in a nation whose faith in our free enterprise system and whose confidence in and capacity to make it work have remained undimmed.

I make specific reference to a group of Chicago retailers in the furniture and home furnishings industries who have joined together in an organization known as Better Home Furnishings Council of Greater Chicago. These leaders have taken upon themselves the task of solving the problems within their own industry and expanding the activities of the industry in every possible way. This effort is being undertaken without calling upon Federal Government for assistance or requesting Federal funds. They have not lost faith in their own ability to make their most significant contribution to the well-being of a country, nor have they lost faith in the principles which have made their

industry one of the most productive in the Nation. They prefer to pursue a do-it-yourself technique in meeting the problems resulting from recessive conditions.

What the Better Home Furnishings Council of Greater Chicago proposes to do to meet the present challenge in our economy is to pursue a broad program of consumer education, the development and maintenance of higher standards of business practice, a more aggressive selling campaign, and more equitable pricing to afford the public a greater opportunity to buy and meet their needs and wants at a time when purchases would have a real impact on the economy.

This organization, with its founders and members, has a firm belief and high regard for the American home and its profound effect on American culture, American family life, and the whole future of the Nation. The three principal officers of the council are Mr. Leonard W. Stratton, Mr. Howard R. Joseph, and Mr. John M. Smythe, Jr. They will spearhead this great, self-help effort in the best American tradition, and in doing so they will give encouragement and fortitude to leaders in all other lines of business and industry. I for one wish them well in this very timely and important undertaking.

#### GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC CURRENCY REVALUATION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement on the German currency revaluation.

The action taken over the last week end by the German Federal Government, in revaluing the German mark upward by about 5 percent, followed by similar action taken by the Dutch Government with respect to the guilder, can be helpful in temporarily relieving some of the pressures on the dollar. Although the Federal Republic of Germany has made it clear its action was predicated on domestic needs, the results are in line with the interests of free world economic stability.

I would expect that the Federal Republic of Germany does not consider this modest step in realigning the value of its currency to meet some of the realities of the international economic situation as a substitute for more basic measures, which must be taken. I wish, therefore, to point out two of the most important of such measures to the Federal Republic of Germany.

First is the need for greater participation by that Government on a budgetary basis—I emphasize the budgetary basis, because it means a recurring basis—in the economic aid efforts to the less developed areas of the world, in respect to which we in the United States have been carrying a great responsibility, even considering our power. These aid efforts are apparently inadequate in order to maintain the position of the free world with respect to these less developed areas.

Second is the need for mutual consultation with other free world nations on monetary, fiscal, and trade policies.

Both of these matters will be dealt with in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. I am glad the Committee on Foreign Relations has reported the proposal, which will enable us to approve U.S. membership in this body, and I urge the Federal Republic of Germany to address itself to these two major questions, in addition to the constructive step it has already taken.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that sundry newspaper articles and editorial remarks upon this development be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the information was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT RELEASE

The action of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in increasing the par value of the deutsche mark by approximately 5 percent must be viewed in the context of three separate problems facing the free world. The first is the basic disequilibrium in the free world balance of accounts, which has been characterized by a persistent surplus of the Federal Republic and deficits in some other free world countries, including the United States. The second has arisen from movements of short-term capital seeking higher interest rates in Germany or speculating on the possibility of a revaluation of the deutsche mark. The third is the common problem facing the economically advanced countries of the free world in providing foreign assistance in amounts adequate to bring about a significant increase in the standards of living of the less developed countries.

The action taken by the Federal Republic in increasing the par value of the deutsche mark is a useful but modest step toward redressing the first problem, the basic imbalance in free world accounts. As to the second problem, it should put an end to uncertainty concerning the future level of the German exchange rate. It is the hope of the U.S. Government that, having taken this step, the Federal Republic will now proceed rapidly to take further steps along other lines which have been under discussion.

It is further hoped that the Government of the Federal Republic will take prompt steps toward helping with a solution of the third problem by moving forward with a large-scale program of foreign assistance on a continuing budgetary basis.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1961]

#### THE GERMAN EXAMPLE

Following the example set by West Germany in revaluing the mark upward, in terms of the dollar and other currencies, the Netherlands has now raised the exchange rate of its guilder to escape the "suction" of the stronger German currency on its economy. As a result, the world's money markets have become unsettled by speculation that other nations may follow suit.

This development, which contrasts with the currency devaluation in the Soviet bloc, vainly disguised by a purely internal "heavy ruble," is a dramatic demonstration of the great changes in world economy since the postwar days of the "dollar shortage." But the German revaluation has implications which go far beyond any immediate exchange rate. It is another product of the German "miracle" of economic recovery and is designed not only to help the dollar but also to brake an economy grown so strong that it has become a magnet for dollars and gold, to the point of creating an imbalance in international payments.

This raises the question of how a war-devastated country, with one-fifth of its population consisting of refugees, with a gross national product roughly only one-seventh and a trade surplus roughly one-fourth of the American equivalents, has been able to achieve such success. It would be difficult to enumerate all the factors involved, but some are quite evident.

One is the German capacity for work and organization, spurred by the hunger years of the postwar collapse and mobilized in a "social market economy" that combines private enterprise with social responsibility to assure social and labor tranquility. Another factor is one of the world's most modern industrial plants, built up with American aid after the wartime destruction and postwar dismantling of the old. A third is German membership in the European Economic Community, which has bolstered its trade with the Community members far above its trade with the rest of the world and has drawn large-scale foreign investments. Finally, as a result of the seizure of German assets abroad in two World Wars, the Germans are more than cautious in making new overseas investments. Total German investments abroad amount thus far to only \$1 billion, of which only \$50 million are invested in the United States, compared with an American investment of more than \$800 million in Germany.

All these factors have, of course, a bearing on Germany's capacity to contribute more than it has done to both free world defense and aid to the underdeveloped countries and thus ease the disproportionate burden carried by the United States. But the same factors also contain lessons which may well be pondered by other countries with more sluggish economies.

[From the New York Tribune, Mar. 7, 1961]

#### WILL OTHER NATIONS JOIN IN REVALUATION?— WEST GERMAN, DUTCH MOVES AROUSE SPECULATION; TRADING IS CHAOTIC

(By A. J. Glass)

A wave of speculation arose here yesterday that other European nations would follow West Germany and Holland in revaluing their money upward.

One foreign exchange specialist described trading yesterday in the world's money markets as "chaotic." "We didn't have to devalue the dollar," he said, "the Germans and the Dutch did it for us."

Several bankers wondered whether West Germany's chief trading partners on the Continent, especially Switzerland, Italy, Austria, and the Scandinavian nations, would submit to a 4.75-percent decline in the value of the currencies in relation to the mark without taking action.

In any case, these bankers agreed, the German and Dutch revaluation, announced over the weekend, has ushered in an era of monetary uncertainty.

#### CHAIN REACTION SEEN

Currency moves taken yesterday in Italy and Switzerland fed speculation here that the Germans may have set off a chain reaction similar in type but not in scope or direction—to the one that occurred when Great Britain devalued the pound sterling in 1949.

In Switzerland, whose franc is one of the strongest currencies in the world, the central bank reportedly guaranteed funds held abroad by Swiss commercial banks for the last 14 days. That would leave dollars held, for example, by a Swiss bank in New York, protected against revaluation until March 30.

In Italy according to sources here, the central bank temporarily suspended trading in lira against marks and dollars. A banker said the action was taken pending the con-

clusion in Rome of conferences on the monetary situation.

Another unsettling aspect was that the Germans raised the value of their money after repeated denials that they were planning to do so. This tended to cast doubt on the statements of other nations that they also would not shift currency value upward.

#### COMPLETE SURPRISE

To guard against windfalls for speculators, governments keep currency moves highly secret until they are announced. The West German revaluation, echoed a day later by the Dutch, came as a complete surprise.

The Germans said, in effect: "We can do something that we think no other country can now afford to do. At a time when our currency is strong, our trade booming, and our labor force fully employed—while, in short, there is no impelling need to do anything about our money—we can anchor the prestige of the mark by making it still more valuable."

But then the Dutch thought: "We have a trade surplus, too, and much of our trade is with the Germans. Why should we penalize ourselves? Let's revalue the guilder and be on par with them once more."

Now the question is whether other nations that can afford to will think the same way as the Dutch.

Speculation that the Swiss will revalue yesterday drove the franc from 23.10 to the dollar to 23.23 bid and few takers. The dollar would have fallen still more but for action by the Swiss National Bank in buying up dollars and taking them off the market.

Pressure on the Swiss franc came also from people who had bought the mark, took their profits, and put their money back into Swiss hands. "This kind of thing (revaluation) opens the eyes of people to speculation," one banker said. "Now the market will be active because many outsiders will join the professionals."

There was no change in the value of the French franc. But sources said the Federal Reserve bank, acting as the French agent, sold heavily to keep its price steady.

Of all the European currencies, the pound sterling showed the widest movement and ended up the weakest. Its final price was \$2.7933—the lowest since last September—compared with \$2.7960 Friday.

Officials of several large international banks in New York were somewhat skeptical of how much the German-Dutch shift would aid this Nation's balance-of-payments problem. It was felt that German export subsidy policies and aggressive marketing would slow but not reverse surpluses which had been accumulating in the Bonn treasury at the rate of \$2 billion a year.

Here are some effects of the mark-guilder revaluation abroad:

Germany: Stocks in Frankfurt sank to their 1961 lows as heavy selling compensated for the currency shift. Lufthansa, the German airline, cut the price of its tickets for flights abroad 5 percent. Volkswagen, the largest auto producer, which exports to some 100 countries, issued a very unhappy statement, calling the revaluation a serious blow.

England: Stock market jumped happily, with companies doing heavy export business leading the advance. Unilateral nature of action was heavily criticized, although revaluation met general approval. Selwyn Lloyd, Chancellor of the Exchequer, cited "evidence of the seriousness with which the German Government regards imbalance in world payments."

Japan: Economists rule out revaluation of the yen. Shigeo Horie, president of the Bank of Tokyo, feels move will pave way for a uniform currency system within the European Common Market.



Russia: Pravda suggested that the Bonn government raised the price of the mark as a sop to the United States in hope of obtaining nuclear weapons for the German Army.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 7, 1961]

DOLLAR STRENGTHENS, POUND FALLS IN LONDON, NEW YORK ON MARK, GUILDER REVALUATIONS

Germany's weekend upward revaluation of the deutsche mark, followed by Holland's similar action on guilder, threw European foreign exchange markets into confusion.

London dealers said they were quoting "nominal" spot rates for German marks and had dropped all forward quotations on marks for future delivery. In New York, however, dealers quoted marks at 25 cents bid, 25.12 cents asked; the German action set a new par value of 25 cents for the deutsche mark, up from 23.8 cents.

Dutch currency, formerly pegged at 3.80 guilders to the U.S. dollar, was revalued at 3.62 to the dollar yesterday, according to unofficial advices from that country. The official announcement of the rate is slated to-day. This would make the new par value of the guilder about 27.62 cents, up from 26.31 cents.

Dealers said there was no market for Dutch guilders in New York yesterday, because of uncertainty about the exact new value during much of the day, but they expect trading to resume today.

#### DOLLAR STRENGTHENED

Along with these developments, the U.S. dollar strengthened and the British pound weakened in the sterling exchange markets in London and New York. Some dealers saw this as a reflection of the view that the German revaluation was primarily a move to help rebuild confidence in the dollar, even though German authorities said their move was dictated largely by domestic considerations.

In London, sterling exchange, in terms of the U.S. dollar, fell as low as \$2.7925 to the pound, the lowest since September 1957, declining three-eighths cent over the week-end. At the opening in New York several hours later, the pound rate went down to \$2.7923 from Friday's close of \$2.7963, but there was a gradual recovery through the day to a close of \$2.7936.

For long periods yesterday morning in London, the Bank of England had to stay in the market and support the pound by buying surplus with dollars. In the afternoon, after the New York market opened, sterling steadied, and the spot rate rose to \$2.7938, enabling the British controllers to withdraw from the market.

#### STERLING "SENSITIVE"

London sources said sterling was "very sensitive" against continental currencies. The pound lost ground against the Italian lira, the French and Swiss francs and the Swedish krona.

In spite of official French and Swiss denials that any revaluation was underway, the central banks of those countries had to support their currencies in the London market by absorbing fairly substantial amounts of dollar offerings.

The Dutch finance minister, Jelle Zijlstra, asked what impact the revaluation of the guilder would have, said it would "put a brake on Holland's economy." He said the action was taken after consultation with his country's Benelux partners, Belgium and Luxembourg. France, West Germany, and Italy, the other members of the European Common Market, had been informed but were not consulted, he said.

Some Dutch financial comment indicated the main effect of the deutsche mark revaluation would be to reduce Germany's domination in the European Economic Community

and help other Common Market nations sell their goods in Germany.

Monday, March 6, 1961

Selling prices for bank transfers in the United States for payment abroad, as quoted at 4 p.m., follow (in dollars):

	Monday	Previous day
Canada (dollar).....	1.0137 <sup>64</sup>	1.0117 <sup>62</sup>
England (pound).....	2.7936	2.7963
30-day futures.....	2.7908	2.7935
90-day futures.....	2.7863	2.7891
Switch or security.....	2.7875	2.7910
Australia (pound).....	2.2349	2.2371
New Zealand (pound).....	2.7836	2.7863
Austria (schilling).....	.0385	.0385
South Africa (rand).....	1.3987	1.40
Belgium (franc).....	.020060	.020020
Denmark (krone).....	.1448	.1446 <sup>34</sup>
France (franc).....	2.0413 <sup>4</sup>	2.0411 <sup>4</sup>
Holland (guilder).....	.2785	.2632 <sup>84</sup>
Italy (lira).....	.001615	.001612
Norway (krone).....	.1399	.1397 <sup>34</sup>
Portugal (escudo).....	.0350	.0349
Sweden (krona).....	.1940	.1935
Switzerland (franc).....	.2323	.2308 <sup>1/2</sup>
West Germany (deutsche mark).....	.2512	.2399 <sup>1/4</sup>
Latin America:		
Argentina ("free" peso).....	.01215	.01215
Brazil ("free" cruzeiro).....	.00455	.0046
Chile (escudo).....	.96	.96
Colombia ("free" peso).....	.1280	.1290
Mexico (peso).....	.0802	.0802
Peru (sol).....	.0375	.0375
Uruguay ("free" peso).....	.0915	.0915
Venezuela ("free" bolivar).....	.2300	.2280
Near East:		
Iraq (dinar).....	2.8050	2.8075
Lebanon (pound).....	.3225	.3225
Far East:		
India (rupee).....	.2095 <sup>1/4</sup>	.2097 <sup>1/4</sup>
Pakistan (rupee).....	.2099 <sup>1/4</sup>	.2101 <sup>1/4</sup>
Hong Kong (Hong Kong dollar).....	.1750	.1753

Prices for foreign banknotes, as quoted at 4 p.m., follow (in dollars, with official rates in parentheses):

	Buying	Selling
Austria (schilling).....	0.0375	0.0395
Denmark (krone).....	.1425	.1465
England (pound).....	2.78	2.83
France (franc).....	.2000	.2030
Holland (guilder).....	.2750	.2780
Italy (lira).....	.00157	.001626
Norway (krone).....	.1375	.1415
Portugal (escudo).....	.0345	.0365
Spain (peseta).....	.0164	.0168
Sweden (krona).....	.1910	.1945
West Germany (deutsche mark).....	.2475	.2515
Argentina (peso).....	.0117	.0122
Brazil (cruzeiro).....	.0042	.0047
Chile (escudo).....	.80	1.00
Colombia (peso).....	.1225	.1300
Uruguay (peso).....	.0850	.0925
Egypt (pound) (2.881).....	1.83	1.98
Turkey (lira) (.3575).....	.0700	.0800
India (rupee).....	.1350	.1700
Pakistan (rupee).....	.1300	.1600
Hong Kong (Hong Kong dollar).....	.1650	.1800
Japan (yen) (0.0028).....	.00260	.00270
Philippines (peso) (0.4992).....	.2950	.3050

NOTE.—Inactive currencies: Cuba (official rate 1.001); Iran (0.0135). Source: First National City Bank of New York.

#### ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE STROM THURMOND BEFORE SENATE PRAYER BREAKFAST GROUP

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege this morning to hear a very fine address by a fellow Senator, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], entitled "Our Nation and God." It was so stimulating in its aspects I felt it should be printed in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, DEMOCRAT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, BEFORE SENATE PRAYER BREAKFAST GROUP, MARCH 8, 1961

#### OUR NATION AND GOD

"Blessed is the nation whose God is Jehovah."

This brief Bible verse is found in the 33d Psalm. It may be brief, but it carries a great message of assurance to the people of any nation seeking the favor of God. We of the United States of America can surely attest to the validity of this Bible verse. God has blessed the United States as no other nation in history has ever been blessed. We have known unparalleled freedom, and our citizens have had material comforts and opportunities that would evoke envy from the great monarchs of history. In recent years the world has been involved in two great wars, but our land has been spared the fury of both of these wars.

All of the manifold blessings which have been bestowed upon us as a nation have come, I am personally convinced, because our God has been Jehovah.

The history of America has been marked by religious features from the very beginning just as the map of America is marked with names of religious origin and meaning. The first discoverers and settlers of the Americas came with the Bible and the cross. From each country of the Old World with each expedition or attempted colony went missionaries, ministers, priests, for the conversion of the pagan Indians and to provide the ministrations of religion for the colonists.

Many of the colonists came to the New World to escape religious persecution and to worship in freedom. They determined to establish a new world whose government would be based on religious foundations but which would retain for each individual the right to worship in freedom and determine his own destiny.

Charters, compacts, constitutions—all the different kinds of formal paper establishing the individual Colonies and States are marked by a highly religious seriousness of tone. It is usual for them to open with an appeal to God, coupled with a declaration of moral and religious purpose, and to close with some phrase petitioning for God's blessing, or submitting to His will. Typical is the Mayflower compact, which set up a form of democratic government that was to be a model to the many American Governments which followed. In the Mayflower compact, the Pilgrims declared that they had established that government in the presence of God, and in service to God and the Christian faith.

This compact was signed in the year of our Lord 1620—and a century and a half later, the same religious basis for political action was invoked in the Declaration of Independence. The rights for which the colonists contended, and upon which they based all their claims to individual freedom and national independence, were the unalienable rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator. They appealed for justice on the basis of the laws of nature and of nature's God, and their final pledge of loyalty and constancy among themselves was made with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence. The Declaration of Independence is basic to our independent, national existence, and its philosophy permeates our political thinking to this day.

During the Revolution, it was characteristic of the Continental Congress, and of the Revolutionary Army under its devout and

upright commander, George Washington, to proclaim and observe occasions of public fasting and penance, of thanksgiving and rejoicing, as occasion might dictate.

Such official actions by George Washington as commanding general was in keeping with his private opinions, and with his public position as President. A typical statement by Washington is the often quoted portion of his Farewell Address, in which he left for succeeding generations his legacy of political philosophy:

"Let us with caution indulge the supposition, that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principles."

And in his Thanksgiving proclamation of October 3, 1789, Washington stated his firmly held opinion on the proper relationship between a Nation and the Creator:

"It is the duty of all Nations to acknowledge the providence of Almighty God, to obey His will, to be grateful for His benefits, and humbly to implore His protection and favor."

After proclaiming our independence in the Declaration of Independence and winning it in the American Revolution, our forefathers sought to secure our independence and newly won liberties for all our people for generations to come. When they met in Philadelphia in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention, the Founding Fathers determined to establish a government which would be separate from any religious faith and one which would place a premium on individual liberty, individual initiative, and individual responsibility. In making certain that church and state would not be mixed, they did not rule God out of our country. Indeed, they based their ideals as a nation on those given us by Christ. For, it was Christ, Himself, who ordained the preeminence of the individual, and Christian individualism was the very bedrock on which our Nation was founded. The Founding Fathers intended that each man should be free to determine his own religion and his own destiny, but by their example and the foundations which they laid for our Government, they made it crystal clear that individually and as a nation we would have to look to God for guidance and blessings to ourselves and our Nation.

At one point in its proceedings when the Constitutional Convention was at the point of breaking up, the venerated and wise Benjamin Franklin suggested prayer and voiced the following concern on June 28, 1787, about the course of their deliberations:

"How has it happened, sir, that we have not hitherto once thought of humbly applying to the Father of lights to illuminate our understandings? . . ."

"I have lived, sir, a long time, and the longer I live the more convincing proofs I see of this truth; that God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings, that except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it."

"I firmly believe this; and I also believe that without His concurring aid we shall succeed in this political building no better than the builders of Babel."

We are all very familiar with the blessings that have been showered on the American people as a result of the actions—which I believe to have been divinely inspired—at that great Convention in 1787. Since that time America has grown and prospered, and our liberties—though constricted of late by

the rapid and vast growth of the Central Government—have made us the envy of the world.

In recent years, our people have given many proofs of their concern, individually and as a nation, for religion. Our churches and church membership have grown immeasurably. In 1860, we had only 53,745 churches. In 1959, we had 314,345. In 1860, only 23 percent of our population were church members. In 1959, that figure had risen to 63.4 percent, or 112,226,905 persons.

Our Government, through the elected representatives of the people, has in recent years given the following proofs of its concern with religion: (1) Establishment of the nondenominational Prayer Room in the Capitol; (2) the addition to the pledge of allegiance to the flag of the important phrase, "under God"; (3) the adoption of the familiar phrase on our coins, "In God we trust," as the official motto of the United States of America and now prescribed by law for all new issues of paper currency; and (4) expression of concern in the code of ethics in Government service for sound morality, based on religious principles.

It is also important in this connection, to note the important part that religious exercises continue to play in our public ceremonies such as the recent Presidential inauguration, and also in having each meeting of the House and Senate opened with prayer by our Chaplains or by visiting ministers, priests or rabbis of the various religious faiths in our country.

While our people individually and as a nation have been showing more concern for religion in various ways, there are indications that we as a nation may be giving more emphasis to form rather than substance in our attention to religion. There is ample evidence across our country indicating that we are not following the teachings of the Master. Our crime rate continues to soar ever upward, and—with all the abundant material blessings which God has bestowed upon us individually and as a nation—there are many signs in the wind that too many, maybe even the national consensus, may have turned to worship the same god as that of our powerful and dangerous Communist enemies, the god of materialism.

Our Nation—indeed the world—today stands in our gravest time of peril, from the standpoint of human survival on earth. Nuclear, thermonuclear, chemical, and biological weapons, and the swift means to deliver these weapons of mass destruction to virtually any point on earth carry grave signs that perhaps the Biblically prophesied Battle of Armageddon may not be too far away. Many who once scoffed at this prophecy some years ago are now concerned for fear of its validity.

For our Nation to come through these dangerous times with survival and preservation of our liberties, we need not only to remain strong economically and militarily, but—above all—we must be strong spiritually and ever seek the guidance of almighty God. We must be sure—as Mr. Lincoln so aptly put it years ago—not only that God is on our side, but more importantly, that we are on God's side, individually and as a nation.

Our Nation, though richly blessed by God, is certainly not immune from His judgment. Therefore, every American must give consideration, prayer, and effort toward individual spiritual regeneration so there can be no question as to our Nation's being on God's side. We, who are in positions of leadership, must be humble and seek God's guidance in determining the course of our Nation. For, it is written in Proverbs: "Righteousness exalteth a nation. . . . When the righteous are in authority, the people rejoice."

## EDITORIAL SUPPORT FOR SENATOR KEATING'S PROGRAM TO COMBAT CASTRO

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, all of us are concerned, and properly so, with the presence of a Communist-dominated government in Cuba. It is essential that we seek means to prod the downfall of Fidel Castro and his associates.

In a recent speech on the floor of the Senate, the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KEATING] outlined a specific program of action which he said could lead to Castro's demise before the end of the year. As one who has studied this subject with great care, I found much merit in these proposals, and I am delighted to learn about the editorial support they have received in certain newspapers. I ask unanimous consent that one of these editorials, which appeared in the Rochester, N.Y., Democrat & Chronicle of February 26, 1961, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rochester (N.Y.) Democrat & Chronicle, Feb. 26, 1961]

### MOST AMERICANS WOULD WELCOME KEATING ANTI-CASTRO PROGRAM

Many have expressed the pious hope that Cubans themselves will shove the Castro regime into oblivion and there have been some prophecies that this is the year it will happen. But sitting idly by and wishing is not enough, says Senator KENNETH B. KEATING. He proposes a definite program to help speed Castro into limbo.

KEATING's attitude that we should be doing something is one that strikes a responsive chord in most Americans. Most of us would far rather take some line of action instead of just floundering and playing the situation by ear as we go along.

"If this Nation pursues the right policies," says KEATING, "the Cuban beatnik buddy of the Kremlin will not outlast the year. The tide is running out on this bearded demagog," the Senator from Rochester told the Senate, "and my conviction that this is so is supported by substantial evidence."

Troubles for Castro are good news for the hemisphere, as most responsible South and Central American regimes have come to realize. It may be possible, therefore, to obtain agreement to the complete embargo by the Organization of American States against exports from Cuba, that KEATING suggests. Trying actively to unite anti-Castro Cuban factions in this country is a commonsense item in the Senator's program. And establishment of a Cuban government-in-exile is a step that could give Cubans still in Cuba a focus on which to center their hopes.

An interesting KEATING suggestion is that Canada be invited to participate in the deliberations of the Organization of American States. Canadian opinion, however, seems to be that the United States was mistaken in breaking off relations with Cuba and imposing the present incomplete embargo. Canadians say this is merely driving the Cubans into the arms of the Communists.

So inviting Canada to discuss the Castro situation might not result as Senator KEATING would wish. Other than this, we share his feeling that it is time for pussyfooting to cease. Cuba under Castro is steadily becoming a Communist state and already it acts like a Communist satellite.



Whatever we can do to squelch this unsanitary menace to hemisphere political health we should do.

### THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, nearly 15 years have gone by since the United States, in 1946, accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. In our declaration of acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction was a reservation under which it was expressly provided that the declaration would not apply to disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America as determined by the United States.

These last six words constitute the so-called Connally amendment, which from the beginning has been a source of some controversy. There have been ever-increasing efforts on the part of some that we repeal the Connally amendment. I do not doubt the motives of many of these people, in that they seek a result which represents an ideal. Unfortunately, however, the world in which we live today requires hardheaded, practical appraisal of the facts as they are, as well as the ideals that we hope someday we can live by. In my own view, repeal at this time of the Connally amendment might well be catastrophic for our country and its institutions.

In the March 11, 1961, issue of *National Review* there appears a masterful and well-reasoned analysis of our stake in preserving the Connally amendment. It is an article entitled "The Connally Amendment," by Mr. Vincent F. DeCain. While he is a lawyer, he points out in easily understood, nontechnical fashion, how the Connally amendment may well be the only bulwark between the integrity of the U.S. judicial system and the invasion of foreign power under the guise of the International Court.

I commend this article to my colleagues in the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the *RECORD*.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the *RECORD*, as follows:

#### THE CONNALLY AMENDMENT

(By Vincent F. DeCain)

(The annual drive to delete Senator Connally's six crucial words has started with a pamphlet by Justice Douglas. With all judicial calm, a careful analyst reviews the pros and cons.)

The Connally amendment, which will certainly come up for Senate action again this year, may well be the only bulwark between the integrity of the U.S. judicial system and the invasion of foreign power under the guise of the International Court. It is time to survey the Connally amendment in all its aspects: Its legislative history, the judges and operation of the International Court, law to be applied by that Court, reservations to jurisdiction, domestic jurisdiction, and enforcement.

When the United States became a party to the Charter of the United Nations on October 24, 1945, there was annexed to the charter a document entitled "The Statute of the International Court of Justice." This statute created the International Court as presently constituted. Under article 36, jurisdiction of the Court comprises "all cases

which the parties refer to it," but nations may also accept compulsory jurisdiction concerning the interpretation of a treaty, any question of international law, the existence of any fact, and the nature or extent of a reparation. A nation may accept compulsory jurisdiction by depositing a declaration of acceptance with the Secretary General of the United Nations. The United States did this on August 26, 1946, but its declaration provided, among other things, that the declaration would not apply to "disputes with regard to matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of America as determined by the United States."

The six words constitute Senator Connally's amendment to the original declaration introduced by Senator WAYNE MORSE. It leaves solely to the United States the determination whether a matter before the Court is within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States. If the United States decides that it is, it can deny jurisdiction to the Court. The Senate adopted the amendment by a vote of 50 to 12.

#### JUDGES AND COURT OPERATION

Of the 15 judges of the Court only 9 are needed for a quorum. Thus, 5 judges (a majority of the 9) may render decisions binding upon all parties concerned. The present judges are from the Soviet Union, Poland, the United Arab Republic, Panama, Uruguay, Mexico, Pakistan, Argentina, Australia, Greece, Norway, France, China, United Kingdom, and the United States. Although there are friends of the United States on the Court, it would be naive to assume that its decisions will always be fair and just—only because, in conceivable instances, only three other votes would be needed to support a decision designed and voted for by Poland and the Soviet Union. What makes this situation even less desirable is the fact that, while the United States and 38 other nations have subjected themselves to compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, thereby exposing their actions to the judgment and criticism of judges of the Soviet Union and Poland, neither the Soviet Union nor Poland has accepted compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. The Soviet Union, of course, may voluntarily submit a case to the Court; but this it has never done and probably will never do.

It has been suggested that the U.S. reservation is un-American in that it is self-judging. While it is true that the reservation leaves to the United States the exclusive right to determine what is domestic the characterization "un-American" is unfortunate because (1) 50 U.S. Senators voted for it, (2) it seems difficult to understand why the reservation should be considered un-American if it is used to prevent the Court from exercising jurisdiction over a domestic matter, and (3) if the characterization must be employed it would be better applied to other aspects of the Court. For example, the Court's opinions are final and unappealable and, therefore, unlike any other court in America except the Supreme Court. Also, the judge from a member nation that is a party to a suit before the Court need not disqualify himself. In addition, a member nation that has a suit before the Court but is not represented on the Court may choose a judge of its own liking to sit on the bench to self-judge its own case. The logical consequences of self-judging by permanent or ad hoc judges were summed up in a 1959 law review article by Wolfgang G. Friedman, professor of law, Columbia University:

"It is also a sad but uncontested fact that generally the strength of national allegiance still far outweighs the supranational loyalties which the judges of the court, like any international servants, are supposed to put before any national feelings or duties.

Cases in which judges have dissented from the point of view put forward by the government of their nationality are few and far between."

Professor Friedman also questioned the competency of many judges on the Court by saying:

"It must be added, however, that the recent deplorable practice of appointing to the Court politicians with less than distinguished legal qualifications, as a reward for services or political compromise, had not added to the status of the Court or to its role in the development of international law."

After reading such an appraisal, the efforts of Arthur Larsen, director of the World Rule of Law Center of Duke University Law Center, become not only humorous but also misguided when he attempts to inform us that among the Court's judges are "some of the finest international lawyers in the world" and goes on to prove this by advising us that—

"The judge from the Soviet Union, Kojevnikov, ranks high among legal scholars in his country. Indeed, he was formerly dean of the University of Moscow Law School. This is evidence of a high order of sound judgment, not so much that he became a dean as that he became a former dean."

While Mr. Larsen's statement is logically so ludicrous that it needs no further comment, the suggestion implicit in his remark that a judge of the Soviet Union is competent to sit with judges of the non-Communist world and will be motivated solely by notions of justice and morality is, at best, hapless, when we remember the true nature of our Communist enemy. It is worth recalling what John Foster Dulles said just one year earlier:

"Furthermore, law to Communists means something very different than to us. To them, 'laws' are essentially the means whereby those in power suppress or destroy their enemies. While we have, through collective security arrangements, largely deterred the Communist bloc from using force, we have found no effective means of persuading or inducing the countries of that bloc to accept the principles of justice and law and peaceful change."

#### LAW TO BE APPLIED

In any judicial system there are obvious indispensable requisites. One is, of course, the existence of a court; and the other, not less obvious, is a body of law to be enforced by the court. It can be argued that a law without a court may or may not be a useless gesture depending upon the degree of voluntary recognition of and compliance with the law. Less convincingly, one may argue that a court without clearly defined law may be successful depending upon voluntary submission of disputes to it and willingness to accept judgments, however strange they may be. But here one must pause and reflect profoundly on the wisdom of a situation where submission of disputes to a court without law is involuntary or "compulsory ipso facto." Article 38 of the statute of the International Court states that the Court, in reaching its opinion, shall apply, "(a) international Conventions; (b) international custom, as evidence of a general practice accepted as law; (c) the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations, and (d) subject to the provisions of article 59, judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as subsidiary means for the determination of rules of law."

There will be no quarrel at this time with the Court's application of international conventions to which the United States has expressly become a party. In applying the convention the Court will look to the instrument itself to determine what the parties have agreed upon, and apply it to the particular case. This is the occasion, however,

to ask what international custom, what general principles of law recognized by civilized nations, and what judicial decisions and teachings are being applied by the International Court in the adjudication of cases before it.

Do advocates of repeal consider the Soviet Constitution a guide to the law recognized by civilized nations? If so, should the judges on the Court be influenced by provisions for abolition of private ownership of instruments and means of production, declarations that land is a state property, work is a duty, and it is the duty of every citizen to respect the rules of Socialist intercourse? If advocates of repeal do not consider such a guide, then the constitution, laws, decisions, and teachings of which country or group of countries express the general principles of law? What law are we applying? The only way to answer this question is to examine well-known efforts to codify the laws of the world.

Probably the most important attempt at codification of world law took place at the Hague Conference of 1930. Of 11 subjects selected by a committee of experts 7 were considered "ripe for codification." Three of the seven "ripe" subjects were nationality, territorial waters, and responsibility of states for damage done in their territory to the person or property of foreigners. Despite painstaking preparation, it was generally agreed that the Conference was attended with little success. Although a draft of 10 articles was drawn up, it failed to get adequate support for adoption.

In 1947 the United Nations created the International Law Commission. In a review of its own work, the Commission revealed in 1959 that "during its last five sessions, however, i.e., since and including 1954, the Commission had finally completed nine pieces of codification on progressive development." Although we might expect drafts for "elimination of future statelessness," "arbitrary procedure," "conservation of the living resources of the high seas," and "fisheries" to be now "ripe" for codification, not one of the mentioned drafts nor any other has been adopted by the United Nations.

In April of 1960, after 6 weeks of intensive negotiations at Geneva, an 88-nation conference on the law of the sea collapsed and failed to resolve differences over the "territorial sea" and "fishing rights." Since both subjects had apparently appeared to have become "ripe" for codification among nations desirous of extending the rule of law, hope had been high that a compromise formula providing for a 6-mile territorial sea and a 6-mile fishing zone might be adopted by the conference. While the United States, Canada, and other major Western maritime powers were willing to accept the compromise, the Soviet Union and the Latin American, African and Asian nations that had stood fast on their demand for a 12-mile limit considered failure of the convention as a victory for their view. The result is hardly a commendable attitude for nations expressing a passionate zeal for world rule of law; and if this attitude continues to prevail when nations congregate to seek solutions to problems more important than 6- or 12-mile fishing limits, the prospects for codification are dim indeed.

That lingering question remains to haunt us: What law is the International Court applying? It is well known that in the world today there are 10 great legal systems, i.e., Chinese, Hindu, Hebrew, Greek, Roman, Germanic, Japanese, Islamic, Slavic, and civil and common law. We have heard it said that the judges forge or fashion law for decisions of the Court by extracting a central theme or common thread from all the known legal systems. The writer believes this opinion to be overly naive, if not delusive, and he believes the reader will agree when he examines the following analysis by Rudolf B.

Schlesinger, professor of international and comparative law, Cornell Law School:

"In countless cases, international courts have referred to this source of international law, and have invoked the general principles as a basis for their decisions. But if we read the opinions, we look in vain for an answer to the question: How did the Court know that the particular rule of principle it relied on was in fact a general principle of law recognized by civilized nations? In case after case, the judge writing the opinion simply expressed a hunch, a hunch probably based upon the legal system or systems with which he happened to be familiar."

In other words, it is quite clear that the judges may roam the earth to discover a basis for a decision. And that decision, however strange, will be imposed upon anyone who has accepted compulsory jurisdiction.

#### RESERVATIONS TO JURISDICTION

While critics of the Connally amendment would have you believe it is the sole obstacle to the success of the Court it is never mentioned that fewer than half the members of the U.N. have even accepted compulsory jurisdiction. The critics then assert that by repealing the Connally amendment we would no longer be acting in "bad faith" and we would be furthering the "self-interest" of the United States. While it may seem strange to find advocates of repeal advancing such "selfish" and "nationalistic" goals, the argument is cleverly designed to appeal to the economic instincts of industrialists or financiers. In any event, it goes something like this: Any other Nation may invoke the Connally amendment to deny jurisdiction to the Court because the reservation is reciprocal. As a matter of fact, in the recent case of Norwegian loans, France, with a reservation similar to that of the United States, sued Norway on bonds issued by the Norwegian Government. Norway invoked France's reservation and France, left without a remedy, realized the impracticality of such a situation and repealed its reservation. All to the greater glory of France. This conclusion, of course, leaves unmentioned two interesting considerations. Norway's invocation of France's reservation was the "bad faith" of whom? If friendly or neutral governments resort to this subterfuge to avoid the Court's jurisdiction, then of what worth is their righteous profession of belief in justice and rule of law?

Furthermore, France's new declaration is hardly one of which the advocates of repeal may be proud. The new declaration deposited on July 10, 1959, continues to exclude from the Court's jurisdiction questions which are exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of France and, in addition, excludes matters arising out of any war or international hostilities and disputes arising out of a crisis affecting the national security or out of any measure or action relating thereto. This latter provision is obviously so broad that France can deny jurisdiction over its domestic affairs to the Court by citing its national security. Also, previously unexcluded international hostilities and disputes have now been withdrawn from the Court's jurisdiction.

On April 30, 1960, the New York Times reported that Indian Ambassador Mahomedali Currim Chagla stated in a recent address to the American Society of International Law that the U.S. restriction on jurisdiction reduces the Court to a mockery. Ambassador Chagla neglected to mention that India has also been reducing the Court to a mockery. Until September 14, 1959, when a new declaration was filed, India's declaration for 3 years previous had been identical to that of the United States, insofar as the Connally reservation is concerned. It is doubtful that India's new declaration will serve as a model

for international emulation as long as the Court is expressly excluded from disputes with the government of any state with which, on the date of an application to bring a dispute before the Court, the Government of India has no diplomatic relations. If an application to the Court is threatened, India can, obviously, break off diplomatic relations immediately to avoid the Court's jurisdiction. The U.S. reservation, not containing such a restriction, deals solely with domestic matters and no one has ever charged that it has been misused. It is India that is making a mockery of the Court by putting the world on notice that in both domestic and international matters it reserves the right to strip the Court of jurisdiction prior to the actual submission of a dispute to the Court.

#### DOMESTIC JURISDICTION

The Connally amendment is designed primarily to prevent the International Court from asserting its jurisdiction over domestic matters of the United States. What then is a domestic matter? A report of a special committee of the House Judiciary Committee on the International Court of Justice indicated that insofar as the committee could determine there are no clear-cut rules recognized in international law as to what are and what are not domestic issues. Does the United States by repealing the Connally amendment thereby lose its sole jurisdiction over matters such as immigration, value of its currency, full employment and tariffs, all of which have international consequences? What about the worldwide relief program that the United States is and has been engaged in? Should the Court and not the United States decide whether the Cuban sugar subsidy may be discontinued? Shall the future of Guantanamo Naval Base and the Panama Canal remain a domestic question or should we expose our safety, security, and economic prosperity to possible interference by a hostile Court. Because the Court itself has never defined what it believes to be a domestic matter we must search for other international signposts showing the direction in which international law is evolving or is likely to evolve.

In the Security Council in April 1946, the Polish delegate to the United Nations, Mr. Lange, brought numerous and varied charges against the Spanish Government. Article 2-7 of the United Nations Charter states that "nothing in the Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state." Speaking with reference to the charges made by the Polish delegate, the Netherlands delegate, Mr. Van Kleffens, said:

"If we are to interfere in Spanish affairs on the basis of such evidence as has been placed before us, I think we would establish a most regrettable and harmful precedent for all sorts of ill-founded intervention \* \* \* so long as Franco does not really threaten international peace and security, whether Spain wants to keep that regime or not is a matter for Spain and for Spain alone. It is, in my opinion, in the language of the Charter a matter which is essentially within Spain's domestic jurisdiction."

The findings of a committee created to investigate conditions in Spain were embodied in a resolution adopted by the General Assembly on December 12, 1946, wherein it was stated, in effect, that (1) the Franco regime was a Fascist regime, (2) Spain gave aid to the Axis powers, and (3) Franco was a guilty party in the conspiracy to wage war. On the basis of these findings alone the General Assembly went on to recommend that if a "satisfactory government" were not established within a reasonable time the Security Council would consider measures to remedy the situation, and that members of the U.N. should immediately recall their ambassadors and ministers from Spain.



History has, of course, obscured the stupidity of the resolution but it has not obliterated the precedent created by the Communist delegate who induced the United Nations to declare a particular government unsatisfactory. This was accomplished even though the U.N. Charter expressly precluded the U.N. from intervening in any matter which is within the "domestic jurisdiction" of a state.

Another case involving the domestic jurisdiction clause of the U.N. Charter is worth discussing. In 1946, India vigorously proclaimed to the U.N. that a situation existing in the Union of South Africa was likely to impair friendly relations between India and South Africa. The situation involved about one-quarter million Indians, mostly descendants of laborers who migrated to South Africa between 1860 and 1911. These people were victims of political exclusion, including lack of parliamentary and municipal franchise, and various restrictions in employment, travel, education, and the right to own property. Since India did not maintain that the Indians involved were Indian nationals, it is difficult to understand how India could claim impairment of friendly relations when South Africa was mistreating its own citizens and not those of India. The U.N. Charter (obviously?) does not permit a state to charge impaired relations with another because it disapproves of the manner in which domestic affairs of any other state are conducted. Or, at least, we thought it didn't. India also maintained, without much vigor, that the rights of the Indians involved were protected and governed by the Capetown Agreement of 1921 and a joint statement of both countries in 1931. As a result of these charges, the General Assembly in December 1946 passed a resolution declaring that friendly relations had been impaired and that the treatment of Indians in South Africa should be in conformity with the charter and the agreements concluded. If nothing more followed it might have been said, tongue-in-cheek, that the U.N. based its interference in the domestic affairs of South Africa upon the existence of international agreements entered into by both governments with each other. What followed, however, proved that such an assumption could be made only by those blessed with visions of sugar-plum fairies.

Two years later, in 1948, the universal declaration of human rights was approved by the U.N. and, in 1950, the General Assembly voted that racial segregation was necessarily based on doctrines of racial discrimination. Since the universal declaration, when approved, was believed to be only a declaration of the aspirations of world government, its usage as an instrument to enter the domestic affairs of sovereign states was, perhaps, unpredictable. Therefore, when on the basis of the declaration alone, the treatment of Indians in South Africa was again included in the 1952 agenda of the General Assembly to consider the question of race conflict in South Africa, many people grew alarmed as they witnessed the beginning of an oratorical transmutation of standards the world was to strive for into international obligations the world must maintain, irrespective of whether the matter is purely domestic or not. As a matter of fact, the transmutation may be complete because Hersch Lauterpacht, an influential justice of the International Court, believes, along with others, that human rights are no longer a question reserved to individual nations.

More interesting, perhaps, is the fact that in the course of the 1952 discussion concerning the invocation of the universal declaration (no agreements were cited this time),

Mrs. Pandit of India compared the basis of intervention in 1946 with that of 1952 and stated: "The present issue falls into the same category and calls for no new decision on principle or effect of domestic jurisdiction." Thus, the agreements alleged by India in 1946 were only window dressing to escape the restrictions of the domestic jurisdiction clause. Moreover, since in 1946 the universal declaration had not yet even been approved by the U.N., one wonders what, in the absence of the declaration and legitimate agreements, enabled the U.N. in 1946 to overcome the proscription against domestic intervention?

But most important is the fact that the universal declaration is now recognized by the U.N. and Justice Lauterpacht as not being limited by the domestic jurisdiction clause. The declaration expressly includes such matters as everyone's "right to leave any country, including his own," ex post facto laws, "arbitrary arrest," everyone's right to "freedom of movement," everyone's right to "social security," and the "realization of the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free movement of his personality," everyone's "right to work" and his "protection against unemployment," everyone's "right to a standard of living including food, housing, and medical care and necessary social services" and "the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age." It stated that everyone's education "shall promote understanding, tolerance, and friendship among all nations, racial or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace." This enumeration is quite incomplete and the author recommends that the reader examine the universal declaration to determine for himself whether anything at all is left to the domestic jurisdiction of the United States.

In addition to the opinion of Justice Lauterpacht, the reader's attention is invited to a 1959 article appearing in the *American Journal of International Law*, written by Herbert W. Briggs, editor in chief of the *Journal*, and a recognized authority in international law, who after mentioning that treaties had been entered into on some domestic matters, concluded:

"Nor would the rule of law be served by excluding from our acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction a list of matters, such as immigration or tariffs, whether or not treaties had been concluded on the subject."

#### ENFORCEMENT

In the unlikely event that the Court should ever acquire jurisdiction over the Soviet Union and render a decision against it, what hope is there that the judgment will be enforced? The Court has no way of enforcing its decisions other than through the exercise of article 94 of the charter, which permits a victorious party "to have recourse to the Security Council, which may, if it deems necessary, make recommendations or decide upon measures to be taken to give effect to the judgment." Unfortunately, all hope of enforcement is sheer delusion because the Soviet Union may exercise its veto power to prevent the Security Council from giving "effect to the judgment" of the Court. In the only instance where a Communist state was caught in the jurisdiction of the Court, the futile gesture of bringing the Court's judgment to the Security Council to ask for enforcement was not indulged in. Thus, in the Corfu Channel case, a judgment in the amount of approximately \$2 million was rendered against Albania in April 1949 for damages inflicted upon English ships in 1946. To date, however, not one cent of the judgment has been paid and no one has

asked the Security Council to enforce the judgment for obvious reasons.

On March 29, 1960, the *Wall Street Journal* printed a letter from Senator HUBERT H. HUMPHREY in which he stated:

"It should also be noted that if the Court were to render a decision against the United States which was unacceptable to us, its enforcement would be up to the Security Council of the United Nations of which we are a permanent member capable of exercising veto power."

Since Senator HUMPHREY sponsored the resolution now before the Senate to repeal the Connally amendment, one would think he could conjure up better arguments than those which suggest that the United States should emulate the Soviet Union in its exercise of the veto power. Undoubtedly, Senator HUMPHREY believes that we should take our ball and bat home every time we are outscored. In all seriousness, does the Senator actually want us to wave our dirty linen in the air and then tell the world to forget that it has seen us? Does he really expect us to submit domestic matters to the Court and then, when the matter has been fully adjudicated before the eyes of the world and a decision has been rendered against us, to withdraw from the Court or to veto enforcement attempts? It is submitted that the United States will elicit more respect for itself if it permits only those matters to go before the Court on which it is ready to accept a decision, however unfavorable. No one has accused the United States of asserting its domestic reservation in bad faith. If it should ever be invoked in bad faith there is little doubt that the matter for which it was invoked would be of such great consequence that if the Connally reservation did not exist to exclude it from the Court's jurisdiction, the unacceptable judgment would cause the United States to veto enforcement or withdraw from the U.N., anyway. The reaction of the world, in such an event, need not be described here. It is far better for a nation taking a journey into the uncharted sea of world law to decide beforehand what disputes the Court shall have jurisdiction to decide.

#### CONCLUSION

We have seen that transitory, uncertain majorities in the Court can easily subject the United States to unfair and unreasoned judgments. These judgments can be influenced by Communist judges representing nations whose actions cannot be reviewed. Other judges consistently support their governments' point of view and have been selected not because of judicial competence but in payment of political obligations. There is no codified body of law to be enforced and those which have been applied have been those selected by a judge's hunch. There is every reason to believe that reservations of domestic jurisdiction will be consistently and effectively whittled away. There is no way of enforcing judgments against Communist nations and their sympathizers. To repeal the Connally amendment in the face of these facts is to invite disaster.

If we must continue to participate in the International Court as presently constituted, it would be well to analyze the wisdom of a suggestion made by John Foster Dulles in 1946 when the original resolution was being debated in Congress. Mr. Dulles recommended a stipulation to the effect that the Court could not decide a case to which the United States was a party unless the law to be applied was based on a treaty to which the United States was a party, or unless the parties agreed in advance what principles of international law should be applied by the Court. Mr. Dulles' proposal may not immediately solve all our problems of interna-

tional law. It is a patient, cautious approach, perhaps too patient and too cautious for the fire-eating advocates of repeal.

# NEWSWEEK DESCRIBES AMON G. CARTER MUSEUM OF WESTERN ART AS NEWEST EXAMPLE OF ART INTEREST IN TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, an important and significant example of the growing interest in art throughout Texas is the new Amon G. Carter Museum of Western Art which was recently opened in Fort Worth.

Mr. Jerene Jones of Newsweek's art department wrote an excellent article entitled "The Way Texas Does It," on this new museum, and listed several of Texas' other outstanding museums. I ask unanimous consent to have published in the RECORD this article, from the January 30, 1961, edition of Newsweek.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek, Jan. 30, 1961]

## THE WAY TEXAS DOES IT

(Fort Worth, Tex., was once a lively stop-over for some of the heaviest cattle-driving traffic on the Old Chisholm Trail. Today, despite its skyscrapers and Cadillacs, it still retains something of the flavor of a cowtown on a busy Saturday. This week, the blend of old and new will be clearly visible when the city opens its Amon G. Carter Museum of Western Art with a nostalgic show of works by Frederick Remington and Charles Russell. The occasion is not only important in itself but is another sign of the growing interest in art throughout Texas. Here, Jerene Jones of Newsweek's art department reports on this trend.)

The Amon G. Carter Museum of Western Art (and its first exhibition) is the legacy of a flamboyant figure who was born in a log cabin in Texas and worked his way up from errand boy in a boardinghouse to become publisher of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram and a wealthy oilman. Carter's tireless efforts to make Fort Worth a metropolis in the Southwest led people to call him czar of cowtown. When he died in 1955 he had left his brand on nearly every part of the city, and the new museum is another step in Fort Worth's progress. Although a director has yet to be appointed, the collection will eventually range farther afield than such scenes as Russell's "The Broken Rope," and Remington's "The Cowboy." "When we say western art," says Carter's daughter, Mrs. Ruth Carter Johnson, "we mean anything that isn't oriental."

Across Lancaster Avenue, in a sprawling civic center, is the 52-year-old Fort Worth Art Center, with a 6-year-old building and 1,300 members. It has more than 200 paintings in its collection, including Eakinses, Innesses, and a good representation of local artists. Its current show is appropriately western—the work of Tom Lea. Director Raymond Entenmann says his members are generous enough, but "I can't," he sighs, "get them to come to my shows."

A free hand: Neighboring Dallas, 30 miles east of Fort Worth, likes to think of itself as the cultured, cosmopolitan city in Texas. Probably the liveliest museum in the State is its 4-year-old museum for contemporary art. Formed by a group of amateurs who wanted a hand free from the constraint of a municipal museum, it put on its first shows in the lobby of a local theater and

then in a rented shopping-center store. In 1959 its board of trustees hired the highly respected professional museum man Douglas MacAgy as director and was given a handsome two-story building by a group of Dallas businessmen. MacAgy, formerly curator of the San Francisco Museum, head of the California School of Fine Arts, and consultant to New York's Museum of Modern Art, has organized eight enterprising shows in his year in Dallas. The museum's most recent important show is some 80 paintings by the Belgian surrealist René Magritte in the most comprehensive exhibition of his work presented anywhere.

"I want," says MacAgy of his plans, "to keep the museum small and I want to cultivate a contemporary attitude toward art in general—to make this a contemporary museum of art, not a museum of contemporary art. I don't want to use any canned shows."

With 1,500 memberships, the museum for contemporary arts already has the same number as the older Dallas Museum of Fine Arts. Though its collection is small, some 60 works, it is choice. Earlier this month the museum was given an important Gauguin canvas, "I Raro Te Oviri" (Under the Pandamus), by the Adele R. Levy Fund in New York. This is probably the most valuable single holding of any museum in the Southwest.

Across town, in the State fairgrounds, the 58-year-old municipal museum of fine arts keeps closely to a regional course, working hard to further the cause of Texas artists. Jerry Bywaters, its director and professor of art at Southern Methodist University, explains: "A living museum just has to serve, that's all." Bywaters' museum serves by holding four competitions a year, one State, one regional and once a year it gives a retrospective show to a Texas or southwest painter. The collection numbers some 400 paintings and includes some excellent Andrew Wyeths, Bellows, and Hoppers, and a magnificent Tamayo.

A new director: The other center of activity in the Texas museum world is in Houston, where the 37-year-old Museum of Fine Arts, with 4,000 members, and the 10-year-old Contemporary Art Association flourish. The Museum of Fine Arts made international news in the art world earlier this month when it announced the appointment of James Johnson Sweeney, head of the Guggenheim Museum in New York for 8 years, as its new director. For the past 2 years James Chillman, Jr., Rice University's fine arts head and director emeritus of the museum after 29 years as director, has been running things.

It is in Houston that the tradition of contributing has been most heartily taken up. Three years ago the family of oilman Joseph Cullinan donated a new wing for the museum. Designed by the famous architect Mies van der Rohe, it is a soaring, spacious structure in the international style. Miss Ima Hogg, the famous daughter of Gov. James Hogg, has donated many paintings, and this year gave her house and its fine collection of early Americana to the museum. In addition, gifts of classical antiquities, old masters, and some good impressionist and postimpressionist paintings have given Houston's museum the basis of a well-rounded collection. In keeping with the old Texas spirit is a gallery of Remingtons left to it by the Hogg brothers, Will and James.

"The museum," Chillman says, "is also bolstered by a community effort with many small individual gifts. What we want is a comprehensive museum with examples of all the great schools of artistic thought. We also have a yearly competition show of local work. I've always felt that any city that didn't produce a certain amount of art was not an art-loving city."

Small but good: Helping in the effort is the Contemporary Art Association which has a tiny building with some 20 works in its collection and some 1,000 members. For the past 2 years it has been working with the Museum of Fine Arts and gives two minor shows and one major show a year in the larger museum.

Across the State, in central Texas, San Antonio's Marion Koogler McNay Art Institute has a fine collection of 19th and 20th century French paintings hanging in Mrs. McNay's Hispano-Moorish house, which she left to the city. The institute's trustees are now working toward expanding its contemporary collection.

What has led to this flurry of collecting and museum building in the State that is usually known for its cattle raising, crude oil, and millionaires? "Prestige," says Jerry Bywaters, "is still nine-tenths of it, and the tax-deduction benefits, and then honest charity." James Chillman says: "This development is not so sudden. It's the second generation that's doing most of the work. And the influx of people from outside the State—Houston and Dallas and Fort Worth have all doubled their populations in the past 10 years—has stimulated the natives."

## PUBLIC HOODWINKED BY CIVIL DEFENSE SPENDERS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the patience of American citizens is wearing thin. Recently it was reported that the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has agreed to spend \$494,000 of Federal funds to build a bomb shelter beneath the capitol grounds in Oklahoma City. The sole purpose of the shelter is to serve as an emergency operating center for the State government in event of a nuclear attack. Evidently, some misguided or overly bright person in the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization conceived the idea that the Soviet Union might make the Oklahoma Legislature a prime target and might fire a nuclear missile at Oklahoma City. Mr. President, if such a terrible happenstance as that were to occur and if the legislature, or part of it, of the State of Oklahoma were wiped out by an intercontinental ballistic missile, I firmly believe that Almighty God would come to the rescue of that beloved State and of our beloved country by filling those vacant chairs.

Nevertheless, the OCDM is going ahead with its plans to spend the money. No one has yet made any statement in regard to why the Soviet Union or any other potential enemy of our country would fire missiles with nuclear warheads at the State Capitol Building in Oklahoma City.

Yet, plans are underway to pay out almost a million dollars—half of which is State funds—for this hole in the ground so that 1,100 officials of the State government in Oklahoma can go underground in event of a nuclear attack; not only that, but Eugene Quindlen, Deputy Assistant of the OCDM for Federal, State, and local plans, has said that the cost may go even higher before the subterranean capitol is completed.

Is it claimed that there is a missile base or a jet airbase within a short distance of Oklahoma City? Is the



capital city of Oklahoma now considered a prime strategic target by our military strategists? My information is that no one has advanced such claims.

Even if this were so, who would be left for the 1,100 officials to govern, assuming they emerged alive from their mole-like refuge, which in itself is doubtful?

It is projects such as this that encourage State and local governments to waste taxpayers' money.

In this case, the loss will be almost half a million dollars on the State level alone. Mr. Quindlen also announced that this is just the first of its kind. It is supposed to serve as an example for all State and city governments to follow. No doubt the hot hands of civil defense officials, as soon as this has been accomplished, will be reaching for more taxpayers' money to provide underground shelters below 49 other State capitols.

Mr. President, of the money spent for civil defense, approximately 40 percent is wrung from taxpayers of States and municipalities where tax dollars' growth is becoming increasingly scarce, and where vital programs for schools, hospitals, and housing die for lack of funds. It is the growth of the program on the national level that spawns the growth of city and State organizations and multiplies the waste. If we cut off the head of this bureaucratic octopus in Washington, its wasteful satellites in States and cities will wither away.

Oklahoma is not the only State by far to have been hoodwinked by civil defense spenders. Every State has its examples of waste by these boondogglers. In Columbus, the capital of my home State of Ohio, \$700,000 was squandered on a traffic-light control system designed to facilitate evacuation in event of nuclear attack.

Some bright boys of the civil defense organization, as then conducted, prevailed upon officials of the city of Columbus—I cannot understand such stupidity, really—to spend \$700,000 for traffic control in case an attack ever comes. Of course, the truth is it will probably never come. Even were a drunken Soviet submarine commander to fire a nuclear warhead from a point 1,500 miles distant from Columbus, Ohio, there would be only about 3 minutes' warning. There would be no opportunity for anything to be done except to pray. That probably would be a much better defense than being hidden in a hole in the ground.

Were an intercontinental ballistic missile to be fired from the Soviet Union, the people of Columbus, Ohio, would have, at most, 18 minutes' warning.

Can any reasonable person imagine all of the nearly half million people of Columbus, or the entire population of any city, trying to evacuate a city in that time? How many persons fleeing in panic would heed this fantastic traffic light scheme? The thought is too ridiculous even to contemplate.

Our State government in Ohio also has a new \$200,000 airstrip at Athens, Ohio, for use in event of nuclear attack.

Mr. President, I mention this to assure my colleagues that I am not speaking in a derogatory fashion of a sister State when I mention the expenditure of

nearly a million dollars, foolishly and futilely, for a bomb shelter in Oklahoma City. In Ohio, in addition to the \$700,000 to synchronize the traffic light system in Columbus, we spent \$200,000 for this airstrip. It is unused. It will continue to be unused. Athens at that time was selected by some bright—I put a question mark at the end of that word "bright"—officials in civil defense as the emergency capital of the State of Ohio in the event our capital city of Columbus was attacked.

Then the emergency capital site was shifted from Athens, and an alternate site has not yet been chosen, according to my information, the silly procedure of selecting an alternate emergency capital will probably never take place.

These are only a few examples, Mr. President, of a list too long to enumerate of outlandish schemes and foolish planning of civil defense boondogglers to justify their high salaries.

Since 1951 more than a billion dollars of taxpayers' money has been wasted by the schemes of this boondoggling outfit. Sixty-two percent of the money requested by the OCDM last year was earmarked for salaries and expenses. I ask Senators to think of that; 62 percent of the funds for this bureau of our Government is spent for salaries. In that connection, 40 percent of the salaried officials received \$10,000 a year or more.

Mr. President, having imbedded in the liquid amber of my remarks this shameful waste of money I now turn to the city of Cincinnati, Ohio.

In Cincinnati it was reported this week that the local civil defense organization, headed by Col. Jack Gault, spent \$67,000 in remodeling the two buildings it occupies at the county home. This sum accounted for more than one-fourth of all county departmental spending for building improvements in Hamilton County, the second largest county in Ohio, according to population.

Mr. President, I assume that the citizens of Hamilton County should find satisfaction in the fact that most of this money was at least spent for improvements above ground, which may one day find a useful purpose of the total amount spent. Less than \$1,000 was for an underground shelter.

Of course, that \$1,000 was entirely wasted.

The taxpayers of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, may certainly feel more secure knowing that their civil defense planners are sitting in plush offices in redecorated buildings waiting for the bomb to fall. Of course, it must enter their minds that the county money could have been better spent for improvement of buildings housing orphanages, hospitals, schools, or a dozen other needed facilities.

It is my hope that the Hamilton County commissioners will put their newly remodeled civil defense headquarters to better and more useful purposes within the near future.

This foolish talk about shelters just about reached its zenith in an item reported in last Sunday's newspapers. Believe it or not, it was reported that some civil defense planners are now talking

about spending taxpayers' money for fallout shelters for farm animals. It appears that some of the boondogglers now see themselves as modern Noahs with the fallout shelter replacing the ark.

Mr. President, the conditions of modern warfare make shelters of little or no use in saving American lives. Were we to be attacked with intercontinental ballistic missiles with hydrogen warheads, the total destruction and remaining radioactive elements would be such that underground shelters in basements and backyards would offer little, if any, protection. Hundreds of square miles would be covered with deadly contamination and the lethal effects would last not for hours or weeks, but for months or even years.

It is foolhardy to waste taxpayers' money on haphazard shelter schemes which will serve no useful purpose whatever in a nuclear war.

At the same time OCDM beats the drums almost hysterically for a bomb shelter in every backyard it advocates evacuation.

Unbelievable as it may sound, OCDM officials advocate both evacuation and shelter programs at the same time. Of course, it is ridiculous even to consider the possibility of evacuation under the circumstances of modern warfare.

In my home city of Cleveland, Ohio, at 12:30 o'clock every Monday the screeching sirens of civil defense sound to the annoyance of everyone. Of course, we have become accustomed to it over the years, but a person coming to the city to visit, upon being told it is a civil defense warning siren, would not know whether to run or to hide or both. As someone said, perhaps the best thing to do would be to go to the nearest cocktail bar.

Mr. President, an excellent editorial "Build Shelter, Then Run, Is Civil Defense Formula," was published on March 2, 1961, in the Cleveland Press, a member of the Scripps-Howard league and one of the Nation's greatest newspapers.

E. W. Scripps was its founder. It is known throughout the world. In the old days, it was called the Penny Press. Today it has the greatest circulation of any newspaper in my State of Ohio. Louis B. Seltzer, editor of this outstanding newspaper, has again shown his keen awareness of the civil defense fiasco. This editorial points out the complete absurdity of civil defense as now operated, and as it has been operated during the past 10 years. I commend it to my colleagues in the Senate and ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

**BUILD SHELTER, THEN RUN, IS CIVIL DEFENSE FORMULA**

You wonder about civil defense? A model basement fallout shelter, such as the national civil defense organization is encouraging families to build, is on display now at Cleveland Hopkins Airport.

But John Pokorny, local civil defense director, says he doesn't plan to install one at his house. He says the local policy is still to flee the area in event of nuclear attack, instead of taking to shelters.

"There is nothing contradictory about being prepared for both shelter and dispersal," Pokorny maintains.

In other words, civil defense's best advice to you is spend \$500 on a basement fallout shelter, and when the attack comes head for the hills.

President Kennedy has a lot of task forces working. It would pay to turn a task force loose on civil defense.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, this continuing outrageous expenditure of taxpayers' money on civil defense follies must come to an end. President Kennedy has asked for a reappraisal of present civil defense plans and functions.

American taxpayers are "getting their backs up," and we cannot blame them. Their patience has been worn thin over the waste and extravagant expenditure of their money. In our Government there is no organization that is as wasteful and unnecessary as the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization as it has been conducted.

One might ask, "What does the junior Senator from Ohio have to offer?"

The answer is very simple. We in this Nation should do the same as is being done in our neighboring ally, the Dominion of Canada, and in Great Britain. In England and in Canada the Home Guards have complete charge of all civil defense activities.

A suggestion was made in a recent task force report that the National Guard of this country, which is comparable to the Home Guards in England and Canada, and the Reserves of our Armed Forces, could well take over the functions of civil defense, instead of leaving the task to the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization.

I very much hope that the present Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization will, along with others, study the task force report of the group headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], will pay heed to that report, and will commence forthwith to save taxpayers' money instead of squandering it.

It is regrettable that the new Director of the Office of Civil and Defense Mobilization has seen fit to be a party to the Oklahoma City proposal. I urge that he devote his full time and energy toward taking a good hard look at our present civil defense preparedness and procedures. The President has expressed concern and indicated a questioning attitude toward civil defense as it has been conducted.

Our Nation has had far too many foolish, in fact foolhardy, schemes foisted upon us by civil defense officials during the last 10 years.

Burrowing beneath the capitol grounds of Oklahoma appears to be another harebrained project undertaken by civil defense. The only result accomplished will be to squander more taxpayers' money. Let's stop this nonsense. If Oklahoma is first, what State will be next? What about taxpayers who sweat and sweat, and pay and pay?

#### MINIMUM WAGES

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, those who would completely control the economy of this Nation are at it again.

Once more the advocates of higher and extended minimum wages are preaching the falsehoods of their doctrine. If raising the minimum and extending this raise to a segment of the uncovered is to have such a beneficial effect on the entire economy why does not the suggestion of the proponents expand, for example, to doubling every wage in the United States and placing everyone under the Fair Labor Standards Act. First of all the proponents know it would be economic suicide to do the first, and political suicide to do the second, so they adopt the approach of "a little of what is bad is not so bad." It may be that life in Washington has dimmed my colleagues' reaction to what the home folks say. In order to assist them in obtaining a better understanding of the feeling of the country on this subject, I ask that a number of editorials be printed at this place in my remarks:

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 14, 1961]

#### A BIT OF FRAUD

Considering the length of time the minimum wage laws have been on the statute books, it's probably a late hour to point out there is a large element of political fraud on the people in the promise that the Government will put a floor under their wages.

The administration now proposes to raise the legal minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25, and the President has remarked that this is because the Nation can ill afford an "underpaid class." Almost nobody bothers to ask why, if that underpaid class can thus be banished by the law, the Government does not raise the minimum to \$1.50 or \$2 an hour. Why should the Government be niggardly with its flats?

The explanation is that if the Government raised the legal wage above the actual market level of wages, the result would be to increase unemployment. When the minimum wage law was first passed it would have been catastrophic to set the level at \$1.25 an hour. Today, perhaps, it can be done because the level has already been raised in fact by the changes in the economy, including the depreciation in the value of the dollar itself.

The legislators, of course, understand this. The present figure of \$1.25 was picked because in the opinion of its supporters it simply, more or less, confirms the realities. If they have guessed wrong, the law will throw some underprivileged people out of work entirely. If they have guessed right, then it is largely an unnecessary law.

In the one case, a minimum wage law can actually hurt people. In the other, it puts into law what is already there. Either way, the promises of the lawmakers aren't what they seem.

[From the Orlando Sentinel, Feb. 26, 1961]

#### A WAY TO INCREASE UNEMPLOYMENT

Most citizens who have heard about President Kennedy's bill to increase the minimum wage by 25 cents an hour regard it in one of two ways:

(1) Most employees make more than \$1.25 an hour already, they believe, so what would be the harm?

(2) How could a quarter an hour possibly make any difference to an employer?

Nation's Business has analyzed the effects of the President's proposal to increase the minimum wage and extend coverage of the wage-hour law to retail and service trades. It finds such legislation would:

Force Mitchell & Co., a Haverhill, Mass., department store, to fire 25 employees, mainly elderly workers.

Drive up the wage costs of S. & S. Cafeterias of Macon, Ga., by \$600,000 a year.

Make the Plymouth Laundry, of Chattanooga, Tenn., boost its prices by about 40 percent to avoid layoffs.

Wipe out the narrow 1 percent annual sales profit of Bridgers Lumber & Building Material Co., of Tuscaloosa, Ala., or compel that company to discharge one-third of its work force and raise its prices by 5 percent.

You can compare what would happen in Haverhill, Macon, or Chattanooga with what would happen here in Orlando, or in Jacksonville, Tampa, or any other city of the Nation if the minimum wage is raised.

Employers, already harassed by high labor costs, high cost of raw materials, high wholesale prices, and restrictive taxes, cannot afford to grant wage raises without a comparable increase in productivity or efficiency.

If overhead goes up they can do one of two things: Reduce the number of employees, or raise the prices of their goods and services.

A variety store chain operating in Florida and seven other Southern States says it would be hit with a \$360,000 a year increase in wage costs. It would have to fire 110 workers—the youngest and oldest women employees.

A Louisiana druggist with five stores would have to discharge 50 of his 140 employees. A Cincinnati department store would have to lay off 90 employees, raise its prices 1 percent, eliminate overtime, and no longer consider hiring unskilled workers older than 50.

A southern laundry and drycleaning plant says it would have to let some employees go, raise prices about 10 percent.

The operator of an automobile parts chain says his retail wage costs, now nearly 15 percent of annual sales, would rise to 23 percent, and net profit would drop below zero.

Traditionally, the minimum wage, passed in 1938 during the administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt, has been applied to workers in interstate commerce.

The idea of President Kennedy is to extend the wage-hour law to local businesses. It appears now as though most U.S. workers would be covered by the proposed legislation.

President Kennedy wants a bill to raise the minimum wage in two steps, first to \$1.15 an hour, then to \$1.25. This would mean \$50 for a 40-hour week.

The effect on retailing and service businesses would be severe enough if only the \$1-an-hour workers were affected, but all workers would want comparable increases.

The need for wage and salary differentials throughout an organization and throughout the economy would force all salaries upward.

(The Communications Workers of America have already told Congress that a new Federal minimum would make it easier to negotiate higher wages.)

Some union contracts in the garment industry provide that the contract minimum shall be raised automatically if the Federal minimum is raised—to maintain wage differentials in the contract.

Business leaders say one of the first effects of an increase in the minimum wage would be to cause many businesses to shrink their operations.

At a time when low wage costs abroad enable foreign competitors to undersell domestic producers, a forced increase in the U.S. wage structure would further handicap many U.S. businesses.

Teenagers and older men and women are the backbone of the employee force in many retailing and service establishments. Many marginal workers find their only source of employment here.

They would be among the first to be laid off if businesses could not meet the increased



labor cost. When the minimum wage was raised from 75 cents to \$1 an hour in 1956, the U.S. Labor Department found "significant declines in employment in most of the low-wage industry segments studied."

Employers cut their payrolls and replaced less efficient workers. They installed more efficient machinery, changed production lines, and raised production quotas. Some also raised their prices.

This is another almost inescapable effect of raising the minimum wage—inflation. It will quickly neutralize any benefit workers obtain from the 25-cent hourly pay boost.

Congress should give serious thought to these matters before it rushes ahead with a new minimum wage bill which is almost certain to create more unemployment, higher prices, and inflation.

[From the Charlotte News, Feb. 23, 1961]  
IS EVERYTHING GOING TO LOOK ALL RIGHT?

Delayed reports and recommendations on possible purchase of \$350,000 worth of voting machines will be handed the Mecklenburg County Commission on Monday. By then, presumably, the little conflict-of-interest cloud that came up earlier, will have drifted away. Election Board Member John Kirk, who delayed his report to look into the double role of F. W. Pearson as county auctioneer and agent for a voting machine firm, now says, "It looks to me like everything is going to be all right." Mrs. Sam Hair, election board chairman, has no comment.

This apparent loss of interest seems somewhat abrupt—and curious. But, of course, Mecklenburgers must look to their county commissioners to clear the air and put everything shipshape. The commissioners gave Mr. Pearson his title. They also approved, directly or indirectly, a trip by county officials at the voting machine firm's expense and with Mr. Pearson as a chaperone.

The commissioners surely will recognize that these untidy circumstances have cast a reflection on their handling of the county's affairs—and money. It is regrettable and unfortunate that the commission should have been made to appear so gullible and unwary. It's an appearance the commission should resent.

We are sure they will not want to proceed with consideration of voting machines without first making crystal clear their complete and undoubted objectivity. This requires not only a dissociation from Mr. Pearson but also a refunding of the money Mr. Pearson's firm spent on county employees.

Otherwise, things will not look—nor seem—right. Consideration of spending a third of a million dollars, of course, must have not only the substance but the appearance of correctness.

[From the Charlotte News, Feb. 23, 1961]  
LET CONGRESS SHUN WAGE LAW CHANGES

President Kennedy wants faster congressional action on his economic proposals. The thought occurs that he could serve his own desires—and the need for fuller employment as well—by sidetracking his minimum wage proposals. In broad outline, the administration plan seems ever so simple and sensible. What is wanted is a step-up for 24 million workers from the present \$1 an hour to \$1.25 over a 3-year period. Secondly, coverage of an additional 4 million workers is sought. Taken together, the administration argues, these steps would advance the humanitarian interest and fight the business slump.

Both arguments are highly questionable. Studies are in conflict over the impact of minimum wage hikes on employment, but there's no doubt they throw out of work part-time, unskilled workers who bear—as

it is—the first impact of economic downturns.

What's true in businesses already covered by the wage law would be even truer of those proposed for initial coverage. The automatic reaction of firms forced to increase wages, particularly in a period of pessimism, would be to cut costs wherever possible.

In covering 4 million additional workers Congress would be dealing with a theory, and not with the balance sheets of the thousands of firms involved. The balance sheets determine employment.

Congress also would be accepting a drastic departure from the Federal minimum wage concept. This was to put a floor under wages and a ceiling on hours of workers in interstate commerce. The administration proposes to cover employees not only in—but affecting—interstate commerce.

This, of course, opens the door to Federal regulation of wages in all employment. It removes all limitations and distinctions in the Federal role and concentrates a powerful new economic lever in Washington.

The least argument for this ought to be clear and present necessity. No such argument is made, nor can such be made to stand scrutiny.

[From the Harlingen (Tex.) Valley Star,  
Jan. 25, 1961]

#### MINIMUM WAGE IS DECEPTIVE

The minimum wage is one of those ideas that gathers support as time goes on because people do not understand the result of it. They say, "Well, I think it would be just fine if everybody made \$1.25 an hour (or whatever it is), and this seems like a good way to get it."

A lot of people find out too late that they have been hornswoggled. Not only do they not get the raise to \$1.25. They lose their jobs altogether.

And even those who are kept on—the more efficient—don't really get a pay boost. They don't in terms of what their new and higher paycheck will buy, that is. For as wages go up, so do the prices of things the wages will buy, until finally it's equalized.

The natural laws, which will prevail in time, simply cancel out the notion that an increase in wages equals an increase in buying power, which means an increase in the number of jobs. That's one of the better known arguments for the minimum wage. But what actually happens when wages are increased without an increase in production is that the least efficient workers are laid off, so jobs are decreased rather than increased. And those who get the bigger checks don't have an increase in purchasing power, because the costs go up all along the line.

Here, reported by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, are some typical reports from businessmen throughout the United States, who have considered the \$1.25 minimum wage proposal:

An Ohio department store's wage costs would soar \$400,000 a year. Of its more than 1,700 employees, 90 would be laid off. Unskilled workers over 50 years would not even be considered for hiring.

In Iowa, a hotel and motel operator said higher costs would force him to hike his room rates from an average of \$6 to \$8 and to lay off 20 of his 85 employees.

A drugstore in Texas would boost its prescription prices and trim its work force.

A feed company in Virginia said it would have no choice but to increase prices 18 to 20 percent, shift several full-time employees to part time, and eliminate nearly all overtime work.

A retail variety store with more than 50 outlets in several States said competition would prevent it from raising prices to meet the extra \$360,000 a year wage cost. It would have to lay off 10 percent of its 1,100 workers.

[From the Boone (Iowa) News-Republican,  
Jan. 26, 1961]

#### COMPULSORY WAGE HIKE WOULD PRICE MARGINAL WORKERS OUT OF JOBS—HIGHER RATE WOULD WORK IN REVERSE

We have been hearing about the rise of unemployment in the last few months. Chances are that the unemployed persons are mostly youths no more than a few years out of school, or persons who have never learned carpentry, bookkeeping, shorthand, nor, for that matter, any other skill, or are non-white.

Unemployment is concentrated among the young, the unskilled, and the minority races, an analysis of the Government figures on unemployment by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States shows. Everyone with the welfare of the Nation and these affected people in mind would like to see better prospects for them, but actually, the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Washington foresees higher levels of unemployment.

This month there is a debate going on in the Halls of Congress, on the air, and in the press about reducing poverty by raising the minimum wage from \$1 an hour to \$1.15 or \$1.25 an hour. Is it reasonable to believe that these young people, these unskilled workers, and these nonwhite workers who cannot now find enough jobs under existing wage rates, will be likely to find jobs under even higher rates?

There is nothing humane in raising the minimum wage and pricing people out of jobs. This is not the way to curb unemployment and raise the national economy.

[From the McCamey (Tex.) News, Jan. 17,  
1961]

#### DEEP ROOTS

Life magazine recently devoted a full-page editorial to the thesis that this Nation needs more, not less, toll. In the course of its discussion, it said: "Whether unions have too much power, that power is no longer directed toward the whole needs of the economy of the United States or of the rest of the world. The enterpriser, the tax reformer, the tariff reducer can do a lot more to meet these needs than any of the current orthodox pro-labor proposals such as a minimum wage hike which would increase unemployment by forcing employers to weed out workers who simply aren't worth more than \$1 an hour."

If this seems a harsh judgment, it has deep roots in economic law. There is only one way that incomes can be increased and living standards improved without running the risks of disastrous inflation—and that is through increased worker productivity. The current minimum wage proposals are a good example of the wrong way to go about it. Not only would the wage be increased, but the law would be extended to millions of workers in local enterprises, notably retailing, who have hitherto been exempt. One result, as Life says, would be more unemployment—the affected enterprises would hire as few marginal workers as possible. A second result, in all likelihood, would be a new wave of price increases—that is, a new wave of inflation. A third result, which is directly tied in with the first, would be to deprive great numbers of unskilled people of the opportunity to gain experience that would qualify them for better jobs.

The biggest current need in the labor-management field is for programs designed to secure maximum production at minimum cost, within the limits of fair and reasonable workweeks and work rules.

[From the Conroe (Tex.) Daily Courier]  
GOLD—AND THE WAGE-HOUR LAW

Numerous factors contribute to the present balance-of-payments deficit, which has

resulted in a substantial decline in our gold reserves. The deficit is the difference between the total amount of money we spend abroad and the total amount others spend with us.

Moreover, the problem could be made still more severe, and still more difficult to solve or alleviate, by certain actions which, on their face, seem to have nothing to do with international monetary matters.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States points out that the proposed increase in the Federal minimum wage could make further inroads on the gold store at Fort Knox. And there's nothing farfetched in this view. Increasing the minimum wage (and extending the Federal wage-hour law to certain local businesses, such as retailing, which have always been exempt) would mean higher costs for many U.S. businessmen. Capital would be encouraged to invest in lower cost overseas areas, thus increasing the gold outflow.

The higher minimum wage would set loose new inflationary forces all along the wage-price line. These increased costs would make it more difficult for American products to compete in foreign markets, where the competition is already extremely keen, largely because of our existing wage standards. Also, the increases would make it easier for foreign producers of many kinds of wares to expand their American sales. So we'd sell less abroad, others would sell more in our home market, and the payments imbalance would swell.

Protection of the gold reserve has become a major domestic problem. It wouldn't make sense for the Government to aggravate it through legislation which would make it tougher for us to compete in the world's marketplaces.

[From the Warrensburg, Mo., Star-Journal]

#### A PRY—BUT TRUE

Americans are a prudent people. Look at the evidence: In a recent poll, 63 percent of those questioned said the President and Congress should do something about holding down prices and preventing inflation.

Americans are a goodhearted people. Look at the evidence: In the same poll, 52 percent of those who answered said they thought the powers that be ought to get busy and provide more medical care for the aged.

Americans are a generous people who like to see the other fellow get a break. Look at the evidence: In the poll, 48 percent said Congress and the Chief Executive should boost the minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour.

Americans are people who also like to see themselves get a break. Look at the evidence: The poll turned up 46 percent who thought the Government ought to "reduce taxes for people like myself."

A higher minimum wage—but no price rise and no inflation. More medical care for the aged, more Federal aid to education (said 40 percent), more housing and slum clearance (38 percent), more spending on national defense (31 percent) and to cut unemployment (28 percent)—but still "balance the budget by cutting Government spending" (37 percent) and, above all, "reduce taxes for people like myself."

Yep, Americans are prudent, goodhearted and generous. But Americans, judging by that poll, also are a people who need a fast lesson or two in arithmetic and the relationship between cause and effect.

[From the Ponca City (Okla.) News]

#### MINIMUM WAGE

You'll hear a lot of trumpeting in Congress about raising the minimum wage but nowhere in the loud talk will you hear much about encouraging greater production from minimal workers to justify that increase.

Instead, there'll be talk about growth, about increasing purchasing power, stimulating the economy, and so forth. And in the background will lurk the union lobbyists who know that raising the floor on wages will tend to help them push wages higher.

There'll be testimony, too, from the other side, from the employers who will have to pay more for some of their help when the minimum is raised. Some will exaggerate, and say they'll go out of business.

The loud exponents deride the objectors, saying: "If they can't pay decent wages, they don't deserve to be in business." That isn't a very filling answer to those who go hungry because they are marginal workers.

Here's what some of the bosses told the U.S. Chamber of Commerce:

One Ohio department store's wage costs would soar \$400,000 a year. Of its more than 1,700 employees, 90 would be laid off. Unskilled workers over 50 would not even be considered for hiring.

In Iowa, a hotel and motel operator said higher costs would force him to hike his rates and lay off 20 of 85 employees.

A Texas drugstore said it would boost prices, and trim its work force.

A Virginia feed company said it would increase prices 18 to 20 percent, shift some full-time employees to part time, and eliminate overtime.

A retail variety store with 50 outlets in several States said competition prevented it from raising prices so it would lay off 10 percent of its 1,100 workers to meet higher costs.

Those are comments from the men who make decisions after Congress makes its decisions.

Congress can order that those who work at minimum occupations be paid more, but if it does it will be adding to the total unemployment that already is a national problem. It will be adding to the numbers of idle youth who in some instances become police problems because they are idle.

And, over a relatively short run of months, it will be feeding the fires of inflation which haven't really died down since the forced-draft economy of wartime.

This isn't expected to change the minds of the politicians in Washington one bit. The raise, of 15 percent to 25 percent, seems nearly inevitable. This is just the other side of the debate in which the proponents will get most of the publicity. This is what will happen.

[From the Cape Girardeau (Mo.) Southeast Missourian, Jan. 19, 1961]

#### A HIGHER COMPULSORY WAGE

One argument for raising the Federal minimum wage, now \$1 an hour, to anywhere from \$1.10 to \$1.25 an hour is that it would put more money into the hands of consumers and invigorate the economy. That, in turn, would increase jobs.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce made a survey in which it found the opposite to be true. An Ohio firm said it would lay off more than 5 percent of its employees to compensate for higher costs.

Other firms said they would not only trim their working forces but would be compelled to increase yield prices. One company, with outlets in several States, said competition would prevent raising prices but 10 percent of its 1,100 workers would have to be dispensed with to keep solvent.

Laws authorize the Government to set minimums for workers involved in Federal contracts. New minimums would result in higher costs of Government contracting and soaring cost of Government, the chamber points out.

Talk now is for action on a \$1.10 minimum instead of \$1.25. That would be more difficult for opponents to counter. But if they

can prove their point about rising unemployment they might sell many Members of Congress on that basis.

[From the Lincoln County (Maine) News]  
YOUNGSTERS, OLDESTERS WOULD BE HURT BY  
WAGE-HOUR EXTENSION

#### THOSE WHO WOULD BE HURT

Many people support the proposal to increase the Federal minimum wage, and to extend the Federal wage-hour law to groups which always have been exempt, on understandable humanitarian grounds. They feel it would give needed benefits to low-income workers.

Yet many workers in that category would, in all likelihood, be severely hurt if the law passes. The reason for that has been clearly explained by the Press-Journal of Louisiana, Mo. It says: "Those we think it would hurt the most would be housewives, teenagers, and older folks working part time, the latter to augment their retirement pay. A hike in minimum pay and increased coverage for retail merchants and restaurants would practically end this type of part-time work."

"Thousands upon thousands of teenagers now earn their own pocket money while they get practical experience, build character, and stay out of trouble in after-school, evening, weekend, and summer part-time jobs. Let's give our youth a fighting chance to make something of themselves—and our oldsters the right to hold up their heads."

Another point needs emphasizing here. Retail stores, restaurants, and other service operations are strictly local enterprises. Even if members of national chains they must compete locally, not nationally, and they must gear themselves to local needs, desires, living and working standards, and so on. So, if wage-hour legislation is needed in these areas it should be accomplished through State and local action—not through national action that would treat business in the biggest cities and the smallest towns alike.

GOOD INTENTIONS CAN'T REPEAL ECONOMIC  
LAWS—GOOD INTENTIONS AREN'T ENOUGH

[From the Blackstone Valley (Mass.) News-Tribune]

Present efforts to revise the Federal wage-hour law have two facets. One involves an increase in the minimum wage. The other involves the coverage to some 1,400,000 workers, largely employed in retailing who have hitherto been exempt.

Numbers of people approve such proposals as these on humanitarian grounds. But what they fail to take into consideration is that, in addition to promoting inflation, the changes would in all likelihood work to the severe disadvantage of the groups they are supposed to help.

Taxpayer's Dollar, a publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, puts the case this way: "The estimated impact of the proposed legislation on the small businessman, the farmer, and the low income marginal workers has convinced many persons of the need to resist not only the proposed rate increase but any effort to extend coverage to other classes of workers. Apart from severe unemployment predicted through any extension of coverage, the inflationary aspect of any increase has been cited. This would be reflected not only in the increased cost of goods and services to the individual consumer but would add to the cost of Government as well."

In other words, higher minimum wage and broadened coverage would both reduce employment opportunity for the unskilled, youthful, and marginal workers, and increase their cost of living. They'd thus lose twice—and these are the workers who can least



afford to lose. It seems to be a case where good intentions can't repeal natural economic law.

[From the Hawthorne (N.J.) Press, Jan. 5, 1961]

#### THE REASON WHY

A good many people no doubt wonder why there should be any particular opposition to the proposal that the Federal wage-hour law, popularly known as the minimum wage law, should be extended to retailing, which has been exempt ever since the law came into being in depression days.

The American Retail Federation has provided a clear answer. The opposition is based on the fact that retailing employs a far greater percentage of temporary and part-time employees than any other major industry in the United States and so is in a very special position.

These employees, it should be emphasized, are rarely the family breadwinners. They work at Christmas time and during vacations. Some put in a few hours during weekends when trade is heaviest. Generally, the temporary or part-time workers are unskilled, and a large majority is made up of students, retired workers, older women, and numbers of housewives who put in some hours to supplement the family income.

These workers are of limited value to the store which employs them. It is equally clear that an arbitrary Federal law, applying equally to great cities and little towns, which would establish wage and other standards not balanced by these workers' productive value, could have only one result—maximum possible reduction in marginal employment.

This is one of the compelling reasons that led the last Congress to shelve the proposal to make Federal wage-hour coverage almost universal.

[From the Denton (Tex.) Record-Chronicle, Jan. 18, 1961]

#### THERE'S HUMAN SIDE TO OPPOSING WAGE INCREASE

The legislative machinery in Washington is beginning to grind away in an effort to increase the minimum wage from \$1 to \$1.25 per hour—as if wages can be effectively legislated.

In the midst of all this, and during the recent political campaign, there are some people who think that it is rather sinful, if not completely disgraceful, to oppose an increase in the minimum wage law. They maintain that opposition to it is heartless. Yet many of the same people may find themselves unemployed should the minimum wage law be increased to \$1.25 per hour.

If legislation were all that was needed to increase income, then we would suggest that the minimum be raised not to \$1.25 but to \$5 per hour.

But there are hurtful effects which would stem from such legislation.

Right now the United States is having trouble with its gold supply. We are importing more than we are exporting. We are selling less abroad, partly because we are being underpriced by European and Asiatic competition. The United States has increased its productivity. But the benefits of this progress in productivity have been passed along to labor, generally speaking. European and Asiatic competition has passed much of the benefits of their increased production to their customers.

The result: We are pricing ourselves out of the world market.

An increase in the minimum wage would further complicate our foreign market situation. It would increase the trouble of the U.S. dollar. Recently, for example, the Ford Motor Co. spent \$325 million to buy further into the automobile empire of Britain. Ford, like many other American industrialists, is

finding that it can produce cars and other products far cheaper in Europe than in the United States.

At a time when the United States is coping with something of a crisis resulting from high production costs, it seems far from reasonable that we should enlarge upon this crisis. The logical result of an increase in the minimum wage law would be a curtailment of employment at a time when unemployment is a real problem.

There's much argument to be advanced in the interest of the human side of opposition to an increase in our minimum wage law, even though the individual who expresses such opposition often is regarded as hard-hearted and cold.

[From the Cincinnati Post & Times-Star, Dec. 30, 1960]

#### ASKING FOR TROUBLE

One of the more politically inspired, not to say demagogic, proposals before the new Congress will be legislation to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour—\$50 for a 40-hour week.

There is great doubt that minimum-wage laws ever increased anybody's buying power. The inflation they tend to generate quickly neutralizes any benefit. Any mechanization eliminates the jobs of submarginal workers.

Chairman FULBRIGHT, of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, reminds that this is an especially bad time to tinker with the wage-price structure.

"We have," he says, "a situation in depressed areas in which people are out of jobs for lack of demand for our products. One reason is price—that we are noncompetitive with foreign producers."

Historically, he adds, "If you boost the minimum wage it has the effect of pushing up wages all along the line," thus increasing prices.

Higher wages, when they mean actually increased purchasing power, are, of course, desirable. But meaningful pay increases must result from improved production, not from passing a law.

We must compete in a world where our minimum wage is above the average wage for most industrial workers, presenting a difficult problem which must be worked out laboriously to maintain American living standards.

A new upward push in the price level would, as Senator FULBRIGHT suggests, be particularly harmful at this time in view of the depressed areas problem, unemployment, and our adverse balance-of-payments situation.

Congress should give serious thought to these matters before it hurries through a new minimum wage bill, regardless of the campaign oratory.

[From the Parkersburg (W. Va.) News, Jan. 17, 1961]

#### MINIMUM WAGE SERVES TO KILL JOBS

Now that wage fixing has become an accepted part of the Federal operation, the fundamental objection that it has no proper place in public administration has become, perhaps, of only academic interest. The possibility of persuading any American Congress of the wisdom of abandoning the device altogether seems extremely remote at this time.

It does appear timely, however, to examine the possible consequences of broadening its scope and increasing its impact. For an advance in the minimum wage from its present level of \$1 an hour to \$1.25 and extension of its application to some 7 million more workers, employed in presently exempt retail and service establishments, has become a distinct possibility. Indeed, it is one of the proposals of the new President's high priority list, and so must be accorded

a better chance in this session than it had in the last, unless Mr. Kennedy himself can be convinced that it would do more harm than good, or unless a Congress which picked up added conservative strength in the last election will recognize the necessity of denying the Presidential request.

That raising the minimum wage floor to \$1.25 and extending its coverage as contemplated would do a great deal of mischief is the testimony of the business community. It would have two effects, practically all business authorities agree. It would force countless employers in the service fields to curtail their working forces, laying off employees they cannot afford to pay the required wages, people who would have no possible hope of obtaining any other employment. Also it would require the introduction of higher prices over a wide area of American business by those who could survive and force to the wall those who could not sustain their markets. Thus it would destroy jobs at a time of widespread idleness, increase prices at a time when inflationary pressure already has taken a heavy toll, and depress business at a time of general economic inertia.

History, as Nation's Business points out, is the best guide to what employers would do to meet the requirements of a higher and an expended minimum wage. The U.S. Department of Labor made a study of the economic effects when the minimum wage was increased in 1956 from 75 cents to \$1. Here is an excerpt from a Nation's Business analysis of that report:

"The agency found 'significant declines in employment in most of the low-wage industry segments studied.' Employers cut their payrolls and replaced less efficient workers. They also installed more efficient machinery, changed product lines and raised production quotas.

"In addition, some employers raised their prices. 'Higher prices,' the Labor Department said, 'might in time have resulted in less demand and consequently in cutbacks of production and curtailment of employment.'

"If those who were laid off can not find work elsewhere, the study continued 'workers in the low-wage communities may remain unemployed rather than obtain higher wages as a result of the minimum wage.' Moreover the Labor Department report concluded, if the most recent minimum wage increase had become effective during a recession, 'its adverse effects on employment might have been much greater.'"

The danger signals are flying all about. Will those in places of responsibility in Washington heed them?

[From the Jackson (Miss.) State Times, Dec. 31, 1960]

#### HUMAN SIDE OF OPPOSITION TO HIGHER MINIMUM WAGE

(By Oliver Emmerich)

In Washington today the legislative machinery is being lubricated for the effort to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour.

There are some people who think that it is sinful to oppose an increase in the minimum wage law. They hold that opposition to it is heartless. Yet many of the same people may find themselves unemployed should the minimum wage law be increased to \$1.25 per hour.

If legislation was all that was needed to increase income, then we would suggest that the minimum be raised not to \$1.25 per hour but to \$5 per hour.

But there are hurtful effects which could stem from such legislation.

At present the United States is having trouble with its gold supply. We are importing more than we export. We are selling

less abroad because we are being underpriced by European and Asiatic competition.

The United States has increased its productivity. But the benefits of this progress in productivity have been passed along to labor. European and Asiatic competition has passed much of the benefits of their increases in productivity to their customers. The result is that we are pricing ourselves out of the markets of the world.

An increase in the minimum wage would further complicate our foreign market situation. It would increase the trouble of the U.S. dollar.

Recently the Ford Motor Co., spent \$325 million to buy into the automobile empire of England. Ford, like some other American industrialists, is finding that it can produce cars cheaper in Europe.

At this time when the United States is coping with a crisis resulting from high productive costs, it does not seem reasonable that we should enlarge upon this crisis.

The logical result of an increase in the minimum wage law would be a curtailment of employment at a time when unemployment is a problem.

There is much argument to be advanced in the interest of the human side of opposition to an increase in our minimum wage law, even though the individual who expresses such opposition is often regarded as hard-hearted and cold.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press Gazette]  
MINIMUM WAGES UP FOR DISCUSSION

Some Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, are preparing for a battle against recommendations for an increase in the minimum wage to \$1.25 per hour which President-elect Kennedy is expected to make soon after his inauguration. The fight will be a resumption of the battle that extended through a major part of the previous session of Congress only to end in a stalemate during the postconvention session. The matter was finally abandoned on August 30 when the then Senator Kennedy who was heading the Senate conferees declared: "No bill is better than the House bill."

The fight in Congress involved two points. One was the amount of increase which was to be added to the \$1 per hour minimum which had been raised from 75 cents in 1949. The other was the number of new workers to be added to the 23,700,000 which was then being protected under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

The AFL-CIO was seeking an increase to \$1.25 per hour and coverage extending to at least 5 million new workers in retail and other enterprises engaged in activities affecting interstate commerce.

The Eisenhower administration had proposed that only about 3,200,000 workers could be brought under the \$1 minimum and that the minimum for those already covered be raised only by 10 or 15 cents per hour. Since Senator Kennedy had favored the measure proposed by the AFL-CIO, it is expected that the discussion in the new Congress will center about the same issues as in the recent session.

The arguments in favor of a higher minimum wage are quite familiar. In fact in the minds of many people they need no explanation. It is held of course that more money paid out in wages means more money will be spent for goods and services and the economy will be thus improved. Further, of course, it is held that the higher minimum wage tends to raise the general standard of living, improve the health and welfare of the worker and is thus a good thing. All of these claims of course are true within certain limits. However, there is another side to the question and that is interesting because very few people recognize the disadvantages as well as those who actually experience them.

In Congress at present some Republicans are contending that a minimum wage increase at this time will only cause more unemployment. Senator FULBRIGHT, Democrat, of Arkansas, takes a similar view. Recently the Chamber of Commerce of the United States issued a statement setting forth some of the arguments against a higher minimum wage. The chamber of commerce has been told by many of its members across the country that an increase in the minimum wage could be expected to wipe out the jobs of thousands of workers. One Ohio department store reports that its wage cost would soar \$400,000 a year. Of its 1,700 employees, 90 would be laid off. Further, unskilled workers over 50 years old would not even be considered for hiring.

An Iowa hotel and motel operator has reported that higher costs would force him to increase his room rates from an average of \$6 to \$8 a day and to lay off 20 of his 85 employees.

A feed company in Virginia has reported that it would be obliged to increase prices 18 to 20 percent, shift several full-time employees to part time and eliminate nearly all overtime work.

A retail variety store with more than 50 outlets in several States said competition would prevent it from raising prices to meet the extra \$360,000 a year wage cost and so it would have to lay off 10 percent of its 1,100 workers.

The minimum wage is an established policy of American Government. There is no doubt but that increases will be made regularly as time goes on and that the law will be broadened to include more people as the economy advances. The only dispute appears to be as to how soon these changes should be made and how large the steps should be that are taken to advance the program. The Republican administration favored a small step upward from a dollar to \$1.15 and a widening of the base to include only a few million more persons. This may be preferable to the larger steps and a greater widening of the base proposed by the Democrats who are now coming into power.

[From the McKeesport Daily News, Feb. 27, 1961]

#### FEWER JOBS?

Congress is at work on the White House proposal to boost the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour.

On the surface, this appears to be a fine idea. Certainly, no one likes to think of anyone earning less than \$50 a week which is what the new minimum would make on a 40-hour basis.

But there are certain findings before Congress that command attention not only of the legislators, but of the general public which has a heavy interest and, of course, a substantial stake in this proposition.

For example, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce learned in a survey that the theory a higher minimum wage would put more money into the hands of consumers and thus invigorate the economy is not necessarily true. Indeed, the opposite could occur. The organization cites an Ohio firm that said it would be compelled to lay off 5 percent of its employees to compensate for the higher costs of a \$1.25 minimum.

Other companies, according to the chamber, said they would be forced not only to trim their payroll, but would have to raise prices in an already soft market—"a dangerous procedure for any business concern."

Another, with outlets in several States, had this explanation: It would have to drop 10 percent of its workers to remain solvent because the competition of foreign products makes a price increase impossible.

We already have statutes setting minimum wages for workers involved in Federal con-

tracts. So higher minimums, the chamber points out, could mean higher costs of Government contracting and the need of additional tax revenues at a time when the national budget already is out of balance and the debt moving upward.

No matter what might be thought of chamber of commerce findings in the field of wages, Congress does need to give serious study to the report submitted by this organization which represents the employer-business community. If an increased minimum wage would mean fewer jobs, then the justice of it is questionable in this era of widespread unemployment.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Feb. 23, 1961]

#### HIGHER MINIMUM WAGE COULD HANDICAP RECOVERY

Among the antirecession measures which President Kennedy has asked Congress to expedite is one raising the legal minimum wage, in steps, from the present \$1 an hour to \$1.25. Labor Secretary Goldberg says this would give the 1,665,000 workers affected an additional \$889 million in annual earnings.

This is another case of the recession's being used as a whip to advance a long-time objective in the hope that the "Wolf!" cry will bring about a less searching examination than normal.

What it ignores is that in our economy one man's wages are another man's costs.

To the average worker, whose income is far above the proposed minimum, it seems quite reasonable to require that no one be paid less. He is unaware of the number of marginal companies for whom the \$1.25 minimum might mean such a profitless operation as to force them out of business, with resulting unemployment.

Our society can, if it wishes, take the position that anybody whose skills are insufficient to earn him \$1.25 an hour should earn nothing, and be supported by the community. But Congress should certainly take a long look before deciding that such a policy is desirable either for the individual or for society.

The American Retail Federation made a case study of the probable effects of the \$1.25 minimum wage in the retail-service industries in the small town of Hagerstown, Md. The proposal is that employees of all concerns with an annual volume of \$1 million would be covered by the law. Eighteen of the twenty-five retail stores in Hagerstown would thus be affected.

It was found that the average starting minimum wage in the covered stores was 93 cents an hour, and in the exempt establishments, 83 cents an hour. Clearly, if the one group must give 42 percent wage increases, the shift in the competitive situation is one to threaten both jobs and prices.

The legal minimum wage was jumped from 40 cents to 75 cents in 1950, a much more drastic spread than is now proposed. The impact on business was reduced by the production demands and inflation occasioned by the Korean war. Each increase, however, has been accompanied by reports of jobs eliminated and shifts to part-time work.

Nobody opposes a rising standard of living for all workers. There is general agreement with the declared purpose of minimum wage laws: "To eliminate conditions detrimental to health \* \* \*"

But a further goal is to do this without substantially curtailing employment or earning power. Congress is being urged now to take a giant step which, it can be demonstrated, will cost jobs. That is completely at cross purposes with the goal of putting more wages in the pockets of workers.



## A SOUND DOLLAR

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, during the campaign and several times since his inauguration President Kennedy has promised to maintain a sound dollar, or at least a dollar which is as sound as the present one. In this effort I am sure that every American has a keen and continuing interest; but it is one thing to promise and another to produce. The spending bills that have reached the Congress will, if enacted, create a further deficit which can only depreciate the value of our dollar; and if he raises taxes to meet this additional spending this in itself will add to inflation. It seems to me he is caught on the horns of a rather frightening dilemma, but he can get himself off them by one of two methods. One would be to not recommend expenditures beyond the ability of income to meet them, and the other would be to grant immediate liberal depreciation allowances to the businesses of this country so that they could attack at once the problem of replacing the nearly \$90 billion worth of obsolete machinery in the plants of our country. The latter course would provide jobs immediately and would cause the economy to soar to the heights which the President and all other Americans desire. We want progress, but not in the field of inflation.

George Shea has written a provocative article in the Wall Street Journal of February 27, dealing with the problems of future inflation, which I ask to have printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 27, 1961]  
THE OUTLOOK: APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS  
IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE  
(By George Shea)

The Kennedy administration is offering the world a classical lesson in how to lay the seeds of future inflation. It is doing so by proposing new Federal programs in new areas of the Nation's life.

To understand what is going on as clearly as possible it is necessary to review briefly what causes inflation. It is often said that the issuance of money so that its supply exceeds the availability of goods is the cause. However, this is something of an oversimplification. It is necessary also to go back of the issuance of the extra money to see what causes it, and to examine the circumstances surrounding the decision to issue the extra money.

The reason for this further examination is that economists have found a good many cases where the issuance of extra money was not followed by generally rising prices, and others where prices rose without the kind of money issuance generally regarded as the most inflationary. Reasoning from these varying situations, economic students nowadays in most cases agree that an essential factor is whether capacity to produce is fully employed or not.

If capacity is not fully employed, new spending through the issuance of new supplies of money is more likely to raise production than it is to raise prices. But if there is no unemployment and no unused capacity, new spending through the use of new doses of money will raise prices.

Actually, if capacity and workers are fully employed, any kind of new spending effort will tend to push prices up, whether it be Government spending or private spending.

The more inflationary kinds of spending, furthermore, are the kinds that do not produce immediately consumable goods. If the spending is on new productive capital, such as a more efficient factory, it will at first have an inflationary effect, but later it will enhance the supply of goods, thus offsetting its first inflationary effect. But if the spending is on guns and shells to be used up in a war, there is no direct offset afterward, which is why inflations resulting from wars persist.

One of the clearest examples of inflation as a result of capital spending is in Russia today, although few people think of the Russian experience in these terms. The whole Russian postwar effort has been concentrated on building up capacity to make heavy industrial goods and armaments. People employed on these works, as well as most members of the armed forces, have naturally had to be paid but have produced nothing currently consumable. Thus their buying power has competed for the consumable goods produced by the rest of the population, and there has been a continuous shortage of such goods. As a result, the Russian ruble has been devalued three times since World War II, the latest devaluation having taken place at the start of this year.

One conclusion that can be reached from the foregoing considerations is that much Government activity and employment is inflationary in nature. True, some governmental activity is clearly necessary, if only to keep people from hurting each other. To the extent that it prevents wasteful violence or otherwise creates better conditions for production, it is in its own way productive since it permits greater production than would otherwise be possible. But beyond that it is very difficult to draw the line between governmental activities that are basically productive, and those that employ people in nonproductive work so that they have to live, in essence, entirely on the production of others.

What the Kennedy administration is proposing is a new expansion in Government activity in several directions. There's to be medical care for the aged, although expenditures of the Federal old-age trust fund (mostly benefits) have risen from \$3.5 billion in 1954 to more than \$11 billion in the latest fiscal year.

There's to be aid to education State by State, although Federal aid of all kinds to States and localities has already grown from \$2.7 billion in 1954 to \$7.4 billion in 1960. Furthermore, this proposal would include a formula for rapid acceleration of aid expenditures: Any State whose effort fell short of the national average would be expected to bring it up to the average. Because any increase in a component figure below an average automatically raises the average, the sheer arithmetic of this kind of competition would soon force the national average up to the level of the most lavish spender.

And there's to be Federal spending of new kinds on national resources, including desalting of sea water, which private enterprise is averse to develop even without Federal help. Of course, all these things are desirable. Better education is desirable, better medical care is desirable, and development of national resources is desirable. But medical care has been improving, as witness the growth in the average person's lifespan, and education has been getting better rapidly, too.

To some extent, these Federal efforts would merely duplicate efforts that would have been made anyhow, and to some extent they would go beyond them. But whichever is the case, the generous Federal hand on the job would mean the employment of more people than would otherwise be necessary—even if only for the Federal supervision of local efforts that would be added. Furthermore, with Federal help added, much of the

normal and practical limits on spending which local management often can impose would be swept aside.

One has only to look at some of the historical trends of Federal spending to know what would happen. Federal trust fund spending of all kinds has grown from \$7 billion in fiscal 1954 to more than \$22 billion in 1960, all of it over and above the regular budget. Whether within or outside the budget, much of what is proposed would tend to add increasingly to the nonproductive expenditures of the Nation—the kind which must be supported by the productive portion of the populace and which, therefore, intensify the inflationary bias that always has existed and always will exist in government.

## THE B-70 PROGRAM

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the greatest weapon in the arsenal of both conventional forces and nuclear forces is now being constructed by the North American Aviation Co. in California. It is the B-70. This aircraft will not only be able to pack the power of any missile but it will pack the power of the human brain which can make decisions that are necessary to the proper use of military power both as a deterrent force and in case of need by an aggressive force. The development of this needed weapon received a short setback during the last administration but President Eisenhower corrected this decision and work has been going forward on the project.

Rumors are heard today—and I pray they are only rumors—that there might again be curtailment of the B-70 program in the near future. This most advanced weapon must not be denied the inventory of our Armed Forces for it will not only fit into the hardware of war, but also the hardware of peace for when completed, it will advance aviation and aerodynamic knowledge farther than any single development in the history of man's conquest of the air.

The fact that the U-2 flew unmolested over Russia for 4 years indicates that Russia did not have, and probably does not have now, the ability to shoot down that relatively slow aircraft. The B-70, flying at three times the speed of sound and at altitudes of 80,000 feet, will bring a challenge to our Communist enemies that she cannot meet at the present time nor, in my opinion, in the immediate future. It would give us a decided edge needed in this struggle for power.

Added to these arguments, Mr. President, is the fact that this is the only manned airplane being developed in this country at the present time which in itself is a sad commentary on the lack of understanding of our leaders of the importance of airpower.

In connection with these remarks I ask unanimous consent that the story on the B-70 by Mr. Ed Rees appearing in the American Legion magazine for March be inserted at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MOST AMAZING PLANE IN THE WORLD  
(By Ed Rees)

The morning sun burned through the gray haze that night had left, melted it, and re-

vealed earth and sky to one another and glorified each with its polished light. The airplane on the ground glistened as it caught the rays and reflected them against a hangar door. The massive stage was now set for the epochal drama: the curtain had lifted, the spotlight was on, and the star was ready. In a few moments this plane, the supersonic B-70, would get her first real taste of sky.

Pilot on this critical full flight is a young, square-cut veteran of 5,500 flying hours, some of them mach 2 hours in experimental jet fighters. Test pilot and aeronautical engineer Alvin White has lived with the B-70 development program for nearly 8 years and in that time he has watched her take shape and life, growing from concept to structure and from structure to a densely packed and immensely powered airplane. All the time he has been training himself up to her, preparing for his own flight performance.

White begins his visual preflight check, which is more a pilot's way of admiring his airplane than checking it. He stands beneath the finely tapered nose that towers high above him—so high it almost seems in flight against the bright back light of the morning sky. His eyes bathe the airplane in near disbelief of its size and in awe of its beauty. It stretches over an area half the size of a football field and weighs half a million exquisitely tooled, delicately balanced pounds. Its long and clean fuselage, interrupted by a stubby, ducklike, trimmable canard, tapers back gently and disappears into a delta wing that fans out like a peacock's tail. And in this tail sit six GE J-93 engines, the most powerful jets ever built.

As he hustles up the three-story ladder toward the cockpit hatch, White feels that to the mechanics watching him from below he appears in the image of a man boarding a spaceship. It is an image he has of himself and he cannot dispel it as he dogs the titanium hatch.

This is more than merely a new airplane that goes faster and flies higher than other planes. It is a new aerodynamic design concept, an advanced strategic weapons system on which the United States will rest its hope of maintaining its margin of defense safety well into the next decade. It is also the airplane that will bridge and occupy the gap between manned bombers and spaceships, since it will live in the thermal barrier which is the almost impenetrable curtain keeping man from the stars.

In the sensibly roomy flight deck into which he enters, White settles easily in the left-hand seat of the big bomber. He puts on his plastic helmet with its built-in forehead microphone and soft wax earphones that mold themselves by his skin heat to his ears. This is the only special gear White will wear. The pressure suit which feels like a tight-fitting mattress, the facepinching oxygen mask, the parachute, and survival kit—all the paraphernalia that has been draped on pilots and dangled from them for so long—now are as obsolete as the propeller: the B-70 has a shirt-sleeve environment even at 120,000 feet, the airplane's zoom-out peak.

White is not quite ready to light his engine fires. First there is the cockpit check—the sweeping eye movements across banks of instruments. Satisfied that there are no out-of-line readings, he begins his start-engine procedure. He reaches to the overhead panel on his right, flicks a spring-loaded toggle switch and holds it in the depressed position for a few seconds, feeding energy into the ignition system of the engines. Numbers two and four kick in. There is a gentle but distant purr heard in the cockpit. White starts four more engines and a slight vibration stirs the plane and flutters against his helmet. The cockpit has awakened: the slender fingers of instruments begin to point to higher numbers—

later these numbers will read so high the fingers will seem to point at them proudly. Soon the cockpit is alive with sound: radios are channelizing, gyros spin and hum, and standby pumps whirl. The senses, but not the muscles of the giant, have awakened.

White now eases the throttles forward, the engines respond quickly but quietly, and there is power for the ground roll. He moves his stick back and feels for the reply of the elevons, and he looks back toward the tail to see if they are in up position. He runs his other controls through and checks his ground clearance. His copilot conducts the dialogue of the endless checklist readoff and response with him. Finally White calls the Los Angeles tower: "B-70, Zero Zero One, is ready to taxi." The tower clears him to runway 221. White releases his brakes.

The giant bird lurches forward, slowly at first but with the impression of great speed. White watches his acceleration clock: in 30 seconds he must have a ground speed of 150 knots or his engines are not putting out full thrust of 180,000 pounds. "Clock's OK," says his copilot.

White now is flying only his cockpit, not the massive plane behind him or the billion-dollar program which is the biggest ever in U.S. air technology and the defense hope of the next decade. His world is reduced to the simplicity and the immediacy of one decision. One instrument tells him to go and six engines with one-third the horsepower output of the Hoover Dam insist.

White does not want to leave the ground yet: he wants to build up overspeed in case he loses an engine. At 150 knots he pulls back gently on his stick, increasing the wing's angle of attack to the air and giving it lift like a giant kite. White must move quickly. The plane is accelerating at a tremendous rate and he must get the slow-cycling gear up before he exceeds the speed where the airflow would rip it off. He is barely off the runway and already his airspeed is more than 250 knots. Now White reaches for sky; he pulls his stick way back to angle the plane on a sharp flight trajectory. Five minutes from the time he released his brakes he is at 25,000 feet. Now he trims the plane for real high-speed, high-altitude flight. Then powering himself into a 25,000-foot-per-minute climb he is soon up to 80,000 feet. He levels off in the strange, hostile, lifeless exosphere at the very threshold of space.

White and his crewmen—copilot, offensive warfare officer, and defensive warfare officer—are alone at a frontier that can be found only 15 miles from supermarkets and hospitals, schools, and playgrounds. It is the nearest frontier to his doorstep, and the last one man is challenging.

Zero Zero One sits high above the earth, its wings resting on 95 percent of its atmosphere. The thin air is as smooth as a poet's sea, and the mother-of-pearl cloud wisps are motionless. The morning sky above is weirdly dark, as wine dark as the ocean of the ancients. And the patient stars shine. Looking out 350 miles to the hazy horizon, White can see Baja California and the Gulf of California to one side and Oakland Bay on the other. The sinuous shoreline of California joins the two. The cockpit is dark and the sun's light does not fall in rays. There are no sunbeams in dust-free space; where the light hits directly there is brightness, but in the shadows there is darkness. It is so dark that the instrument panel must be lighted at all times. The cockpit is not quiet; there is a rumble from the ram effect of mach 3 flight. It is a rumble never heard by pilots before. The outside air is -70° F. but it is not fresh air. The content of toxic ozone ranges from 2 to 20 parts in a million parts of air—many times greater than the amount that produces Los Angeles' acid smog.

The B-70 feels like any other large jet airplane, smells like all others with its sharp

odor of metal and oil and electricity. To Pilot White the plane handles like other high-performance aircraft: it is alert and sensitive and powerful—perhaps a little more than others. But this is a different airplane, different in every important way. First off, it is different in performance—not merely better but different. From this spot in the California skies White could fly to New York in an hour and a half, to London in 2½ hours, to Karachi in 3½ hours, to Moscow in 3 hours. He would cruise at mach 3, 2,000 miles per hour all the way, and at altitudes between 80,000 and 100,000 feet. And he would do so weighing more than half a million pounds at takeoff.

The B-70 is more than an improvement, a growth version, of such advanced aircraft as the X-15, the B-52 and the B-58; it is a prototype of a new breed of aircraft, a quantum jump over anything now flying. This airplane is important not merely for its functional value as a weapons system but for its historic promise: it is a technological platform that will give the United States a greater reach into the realm of high flight and high-speed flight than anyone might have dreamed probably a few years ago.

A barrier—the heat barrier—as seemingly impenetrable as the one that faced aviation at the end of World War II, when the propeller aircraft reached its speed and altitude ceilings at 500 m.p.h. and 35,000 feet—confronted and confounded engineers and military planners in the midfifties. When they studied the nature of it, the cost and complexity as well as the technical doubt over how to pass this barrier, many gave serious thought to abandoning the manned aircraft after the planes then under development were aged out of the skies. The ballistic missiles were coming into their own at the time and some military thinkers believed these could replace the manned bomber. Instead of going through the heat barrier, the wise procedure seemed to avoid it.

The B-70 was the breakthrough or, as Edward Teller prefers to call it, a push-through beyond this development barrier. It is more than an airplane that will cruise four times faster and fly 100 percent higher than the B-52 and still go as far. It is a new design concept, the first of a new generation of supersonic aircraft, the device through which aviation progress, which nearly had been ended, will be recycled.

From the B-70 will come supersonic transports that will make today's jets seem like gear-grinding trucks and tomorrow's airline schedules seem like printers' mistakes. The B-70 will fly at the threshold of space, and for this reason it can be utilized as a launching platform from which U.S. reconnaissance and scientific satellites can be injected into orbit and from which Soviet space vehicles might be interdicted. Most important, and most immediate, the B-70 is a bomber of extraordinary performance. It is the furthest extension of U.S. military technology, a mach 3 weapons system that is in some ways more awesome than the missile and more potent than anything the Russians are believed to have. One thing is known: The Soviets do not have a defense against it.

What barrier did the B-70 crash through? What new design concepts and technology went into it? Why mach 3? Some of the answers to these questions are wrapped in a heavy curtain of military security; some are hidden in the hieroglyphics of engineering formulas. We do know that about a year ago a strange and wonderful thing happened. It was if the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle began falling into place. Almost simultaneously research programs that had been underway at National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics labs in Virginia, California, and Ohio, began to pay off. The result—this is oversimplification, but it is



not overstatement—was that the companies concerned (i.e., North American and Boeing) and the Air Force suddenly realized it would not be much harder to design a long-range bomber that could fly its whole mission supersonic than to design one that would fly subsonic all the way with only a small fraction of the flight supersonic. Not only that, but the top speed of the prospective bomber was raised to mach 3, about 2,000 miles per hour.

The key piece of the puzzle involved a physics principle known as compression lift. Its aeronautical application was postulated by two NACA engineers at Langley Field in March 1956. The engineers, A. J. Eggers, and C. A. Syvertson, wrote an esoteric scientific report titled "Aircraft Configurations Developing High Lift-Drag Ratios at High Supersonic Speeds." It was stamped "Secret" and sent to dozens of technical libraries and research laboratories and was promptly forgotten if it was ever noted at all. During a critical moment in the development of the B-70, however, this key report was discovered.

In looking for a new design approach, North American assigned an engineer to search the vast technical literature on high-speed flight on the unlikely possibility of finding gold in the library dust. The scheme paid off: the NACA paper on compression lift was found and its application to the supersonic bomber was obvious. It said, in effect, that a conical body has the ability to produce an increase in pressure under a surface. Why not put a conical structure beneath the wing and gain a lift bonus? Paper studies and wind-tunnel data showed spectacular possibilities if the air-intake section were made conical and put beneath the wing. North American board chairman J. H. "Dutch" Kindelberger, one of aviation's greatest pioneers, a former engineer himself and generally regarded as the industry's elder statesman, said flatly: "I've been in this business for more than 40 years, and I've never seen anything like the engineering solution to this problem."

Compression lift is the use of the shock wave created by the airplane itself for added lift. Just how the B-70 uses this wave, and the details of the design gimmicks that help it, are among the most closely guarded secrets of the program. Engineers not directly connected with the project have speculated on how this is done. Their explanation goes like this:

As the long gooseneck of the B-70 rams along at mach 3, it clears a pathway of air so the rest of the 170-foot fuselage may pass. The pushed-aside air is piled up in a V-shaped pattern similar to the bow wave made by the prow of a ship on a calm lake. In a way this wave might be visualized as the curbs of the pathway made by the B-70. These curbs are, of course, compressed air, and they are directed beneath the wings of the plane. Since this curb air is higher pressure than the air above the wing, the plane sitting on this cushion gets added lift. The B-70 shock wave, created by the enormous mass and momentum of half a million pounds, is thus converted to lift energy. To milk it for full value, North American engineers also devised a way to amplify it and keep it channeled against the undersurfaces of the wing for the longest possible time. Thus, in a sense, the B-70 is something like an aerial catamaran—up on the step of its own shock wave and riding it for all it's worth, and it is worth 30 percent additional lift. This is scot-free lift: not an extra pound of thrust or gallon of fuel is required to buy it.

Speed, the speed of a bullet in flight—this is the B-70's proud theme. (Its cruising speed is 2,900 feet per second, the muzzle

velocity of a 30.06 bullet is 2,700 feet per second). For nearly a decade large aircraft have been trapped in the aerodynamically unattractive speed zone between mach .75 and mach 1.5. Here speed reaches the point of diminishing returns in terms of range. Beyond mach 2, according to every slide rule, speed should buy more range. An airplane traveling at mach 3 would go half as far again as one traveling at mach 2.

But to fly at mach 3 requires something more than an improvement in propulsion or a new airframe design: it requires a greatly enhanced aeronautical technology. The prize of great speed lay in the trap of the atmospheric oven, and to snatch it without burning up is a trick no one knew in 1955. The men who made the B-70 had to learn it, and they did.

Why mach 3? Why not mach 5 or mach 10? The reason is aerodynamic heating: mach 2 is the bare beginning of the high-heat problem, and mach 3 is really into it. And the temperature goes up from there as the square of speed. At mach 3 the heat is 550°; at mach 4 it is 840°. Mach 3 is the beginning of a long rising plateau of flight progress, and engineers feel certain that once they have gained 2,000 miles per hour they will be able to push the B-70 configuration up to 4,000 miles per hour.

Planes zooming to the threshold of space have a high-speed departure problem as satellites and missiles returning to earth have their reentry problem. Vehicles moving at mach 2 and higher through the atmosphere collide mightily with air molecules. This friction induces high skin heating. And this intense heat precludes the use of aluminum, the structural metal most widely used in subsonic and transonic aircraft. Lightweight and strong, it can take structural stress, but it cannot take heat; at 250°, aluminum welds and loses its strength. The ideal high-temperature metals are stainless steel and titanium. But these were regarded as too heavy for use except on a few critical parts (in afterburners, for example) of high-speed aircraft too heavy and too difficult to fabricate. But this was just one heat problem. Another was how to keep the inside of the plane cool enough for crew and equipment—a prime problem in an airplane flying in the -70° cold of an 80,000-foot sky.

The B-58 Hustler was the first operational airplane to be given aerodynamic heat protection. This was done with honeycombed aluminum fabrication of a few critical heat-prone parts. Although the Hustler is in mach 2 heat for a relatively short time, the temperature gets sufficiently high to break down the glue that binds the honeycomb assembly. Clearly, the mach 3 B-70 could not use aluminum or any glue adhesive; its skin had to be made of stainless steel honeycomb with metal-to-metal binding.

The honeycombed steel sandwich that was developed for the B-70 fulfilled all requirements. It consists of two face plates between which honeycombed steel foil is placed. The brazing process proved simple: a thin sheet of silver brazing foil is put, like butter, against the face plates. The honeycombed steel foil is then placed in the middle. The entire assembly is put into a brazing furnace and heated until the silver foil melts and glues the honeycomb to the face plates. Then the sandwich is cooled until the "glue" hardens into solid metal. The result is a piece of steel that is not only strong and lightweight but also has marvelous insulating properties. The air in the honeycomb cells gives it this.

B-70 manufacturing tolerances are exceedingly fine: a fingerprint on the metal will prevent proper brazing, so the preparation must be done in temperature-controlled, dust-free rooms by handlers who

wear white nylon (nonlint) gloves. Weight in supersonic aircraft is critical, so steel must be rolled as fine as possible—down to 0.002 inch. One engineer laid down the most accurate and succinct requirement for the mach 3 airplane: "It must be built as strong as a bridge and as precise as a watch." This is the technology that goes into the B-70—the technology that must go into space vehicles when they are built.

Because Al White flies along at such great height and speed, he is detached from the earth in a way few airmen before him have been. He cannot rely on ground stations for position reports and he has a problem receiving landing instructions from airfields because he must begin his letdown 300 miles out and tower communications and traffic-control systems cannot handle this distance and speed. White must rely on the equipment in his ship.

He navigates with a stellar-inertial guidance system, a multimillion-dollar device that incorporates a star-tracking unit, an inertial platform, radar, and digital computer. This is his bomb/nav system which will be programmed with complete data from takeoff to target, can accept additional inputs from sensors to make en route changes and corrections which no mere pilot or bombardier or navigator could calculate at the B-70's 30-mile-a-minute speed. For target sighting, the B-70 has search and Doppler radars that are years ahead of anything now in use. Resolution of radar pictures presented on the navigator's scope is as sharp as if they were taken through high-powered telescopes.

Fully matching the major subsystems and the airframe design itself in sophistication and performance is the propulsion component. The GE J-93 turbojet engine is the most advanced engine this side of the Iron Curtain, and probably the other side of it, too. Its mach 3 thrust output is incredible: one engine can generate the equivalent of enough energy to power 50 diesel locomotives or light a city of 60,000 people. Not as spectacular, but just as important in wartime, is its easy field-handling and quick-change characteristics. To replace an engine in today's bomber requires more time than the probable duration of the future all-out war itself: a factory-new engine must be given a 2-day buildup during which the accessory equipment—electrical and hydraulic—is hooked up. The B-70 engine does not require a buildup: the accessories are bolted to the airplane, are not in the engine. This is the quick-change plug-in concept. The B-70 engine can be changed (the old one removed and the new one put in) by 4 men in 25 minutes.

Another precedent-breaking advantage of the B-70's propulsion system is that engines are interchangeable. On all other aircraft the engines must be fitted into a particular slot: a No. 2 engine cannot be installed in a No. 3 position because of the accessory gear. In view of the J-93's plug-in feature, any engine can go anywhere in the B-70's six-barreled tail. This solves one of the Air Force's knottiest logistics problems, but for all its complexity and technological elegance, the B-70 is essentially a practical airplane. It must be: it is built for combat use, not for a design contest.

It comes equipped with a flyaway alert pod, a powerful little power package that is scabbled onto the plane's belly aft of the landing gear and is aerodynamically clean so it can be carried by the B-70 in flight. It contains a small turbine engine, thrust-worthy enough in its own right to fly a small plane. And it has its own fuel. This pod gives the B-70 a quick-start capability: it can fire enough power into the big bird to pressurize the hydraulic lines, to activate the electric and air-conditioning systems,

and, most important, to permit the pilot to gangbar all six engines for simultaneous start. Thus the B-70 can be rolling in 2 minutes and be airborne in 3 from a dead start.

It has been said that there are three kinds of aircraft in the U.S. military inventory: The obsolescent, the experimental, and the resurrected. The B-70 is a fourth kind: The only. It is the only new airplane under development and the only one designed to live in the missile age. Strategically, the B-70 has a mission that neither the missile nor the transonic bomber can fill. The B-70 is important because it is the only vehicle which carries the advantages of the manned bomber into an era where it will be needed. And these advantages, and the need for them, are becoming more and more apparent as the missile matures to the point where it is beginning to reveal its own limitations, notably Man, M-1.

In the past decade the scientist and the missile engineer have worked to make man technologically unemployed in future combat vehicles. To them, man seemed an abominably designed piece of equipment: 180 pounds of frame to support a 45-ounce payload—his brain—which was all they wanted to take along on the ride anyway. Not only that, but he had to have hundreds of pounds of support equipment to keep this frame cool and comfortable, safe and fail-safe. And all vehicles he traveled in had to be designed for the round trip. It would be far better to build more efficient, less demanding black boxes to do man's job. But trying to replace man, even duplicating some of his functions, turned out to be far more formidable and far less possible than the engineer and scientist believed, and it won in them a new respect, a professional admiration for the Creator and His design. The more they studied the matter the more they admired everything about man, including what they now considered his amazingly low weight-to-payload ratio and the exquisite (and unfathomable) circuitry of his mind. His intelligence, for example, could not be reduced to electronic circuitry. The computer scientist would have considered it a high achievement to be able to develop a black box with intelligence in the amount of 10 to the 14th power of bits (a computer data point). This is the degree of intelligence the angelfish must have in order to tell his rear to go where his front wants to go—around a rock or over a blade of grass. Even man's packaging was far better than they could design for their electronics gear. Not only that, but the black boxes revealed that they had humanlike frailties: they had to be cooled and protected from vibration and, all in all, they were not nearly as rugged as the equipment they were designed to replace. But most awesome was the man-product itself: 10 billion diodes in a package that weighs only 180 pounds. Gone for all time was the old contempt. For this reason the inhabited vehicle—whether it is a spaceship or a combat system—will have a role in the future. Preparing the way, proving the way, is the B-70—flown by Al White and his crew.

### THIRTIETH BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF REPUBLIC AVIATION CORP.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I should like to take a moment today to commend New York's Republic Aviation Corp. which celebrated its 30th birthday last month.

During its 30-year history, Republic has grown from a handful of aviation pioneers occupying an old farmhouse,

one hangar, and a 127-acre grass landing field—with working capital of \$1,968—to a worldwide organization that employs nearly 15,000 people, meets a payroll amounting to \$114 million a year, and occupies a total of 57 buildings on 560 acres.

Mr. President, I am happy to pay tribute to the Republic Aviation Corp. and to the thousands of their employees for the progress which they have made in the past 30 years and for the many substantial contributions which they have made to the economy of New York State and the Nation as a whole.

### THE COMMUNIST INFILTRATION IN THE NUCLEAR TEST BAN MOVEMENT—STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee first looked into the question of Communist infiltration in the nuclear test ban movement in May of last year. At that time, evidence had come into the hands of the subcommittee, indicating that the Communist Party had made the nuclear test ban movement the chief target of its infiltration operations in this country; that members and followers of the Communist Party were receiving directives to enter into the test ban movement and participate actively in it; that there was, in consequence, a serious Communist infiltration at chapter level throughout the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

On May 19, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy held a rally at Madison Square Garden in New York City, which was addressed by many eminent speakers associated with both political parties. It developed that the organizer of this meeting, Mr. Harry Abrams, was a veteran member of the Communist Party. In his appearance before the subcommittee, he invoked the fifth amendment in reply to a whole series of questions relating to his Communist activities.

I reported on this situation in a statement to the Senate on May 25, 1960. In this statement, among other things, I made the following observations:

The Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy is headed by a group of nationally prominent citizens about whose integrity and good faith there is no question. Among them are people like Norman Cousins, of the Saturday Review, Mr. Clarence Pickett, of the American Friends Service Committee, Mr. Norman Thomas, and others. They advocate a point of view which some of us consider unrealistic or utopian, but it is, nevertheless, a significant point of view on an issue of life and death importance. For the personal motivation of most of those associated with the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy I have the most sincere respect. The point of view they represent deserves a hearing—indeed, it must be heard.

I believe that the heads of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy have a serious contribution to make to the great debate on national policy. But they can only make this contribution effectively if they purge their ranks ruthlessly of Communist infiltration and if they clearly demarcate their

own position from that of the Communists, first, by stressing the need for adequate inspection, second, by reiterating at every opportunity their opposition to the tyranny of communism.

I can think of other things that can and should be done by the directors of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy and of other non-Communist organizations that must contend with the problem of Communist infiltration. At top level, control is relatively easy. One can more or less assume that the people who are elected to a board of directors or to a national committee have enjoyed public visibility over a period of years so that their records are known. At the local level, not even the FBI with all of its resources could offer a 100-percent guarantee against infiltration. However, I think it is possible for organizations to exercise a good deal of control by carefully examining the personal records and bona fides (1) of all those who volunteer to help establish local organizations; (2) of those who are elected to office in local organizations; (3) of all those assigned to organizing activities.

In my closing remarks I paid tribute to Mr. Norman Cousins, the chairman of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy for the manner in which he reacted to the revelations of the subcommittee. Not only did he act immediately to suspend Mr. Abrams, but, when he saw me in Washington, he pledged his cooperation to the subcommittee in dealing with the problem of Communist infiltration in the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

I believe that the statement I made at the time was restrained and fair. Indeed, I received quite a few letters from the officers and members of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, expressing their personal appreciation to me for bringing the question of Communist infiltration into the open—and for doing this in a manner that was fair to the organization and to its national leaders.

But there are always those who will not be satisfied by even the most meticulous fairness when Communist subversion or Communist infiltration is under investigation. Thus, the New York Post commented editorially at the time that the Communist infiltration exposed by Senator Dodd consisted of one lone Communist infiltrator—"count them," said the editor.

In my statement I had pointed out that the subcommittee had received evidence that Harry Abrams was not a lone phenomenon—that there was in fact a serious Communist infiltration in many of the local chapters of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

In a series of hearings held in October 1960, the subcommittee looked into the matter of Communist infiltration in the New York area. Twenty-seven witnesses who had been active in the Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, or had been associated with it in some way, appeared before the subcommittee. In accordance with the committee's practice, the hearings were held in executive session to protect both the committee and witnesses against false or unsubstantiated allegations. The testimony of four witnesses, in line with this procedure, has not been printed as part of the hearings. Of the remaining 23



witnesses, 22 invoked the fifth amendment when asked whether they were members of the Communist Party and other questions relating to Communist activities. Nine of these fifth amendment witnesses were chairmen of locals of the Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy; 3 were members; and 10 had either contributed to the Greater New York committee, or had paid for advertisements in the program of the Madison Square Garden meeting, or had worked for the committee as volunteers. An additional fifth amendment witness was Arnold Johnson, legislative director of the Communist Party, who is not a member of SANE, but who was called before the committee for the purpose of establishing that the Communist Party has made it a deliberate policy to encourage the infiltration of such organizations.

Before these hearings were held, the national committee for SANE, as I already pointed out, had taken certain measures to deal with the problem of Communist infiltration. On May 26 the board of directors of the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy adopted a statement of policy barring members of the Communist Party or individuals who are not free because of party discipline and party allegiance from any office in the organization. It specified that this was to apply to all local committee leaders, to future candidates for these posts, to staff members and public spokesmen. It said that individuals who could not uphold this policy should not accept or maintain their positions in the organization. It authorized the national committee to hear charges against individual leaders, staff members and public spokesmen, to demand their resignation if the evidence warranted this and to take further action if they refused to resign.

The problem was how to implement these regulations and give them some force.

When the subcommittee subpoenaed the witnesses who appeared before it in the recent hearings, the national committee advised these witnesses not to invoke the fifth amendment, and it offered the services of the committee's counsel, Mr. William Butler, an experienced civil liberties lawyer, to all those who had been subpoenaed. With one lone exception, the members and local officers of the Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy who were scheduled to appear before the subcommittee refused the national committee's offer of legal aid and appeared, instead, with their own lawyers.

Because of the affirmative attitude of the national committee in coping with this problem, I considered it my duty to advise them, although I could not release the details of the testimony to them, that the great majority of the witnesses who had appeared before the subcommittee had invoked the fifth amendment and that among these were some half-dozen chairmen of locals in the Greater New York area.

At the time this advice was conveyed to the national committee, it already had the question of the Greater New York committee under consideration.

In mid-October, the national committee asked the Greater New York committee to show cause why its charter should not be revoked. At the same time, it publicly dissociated itself from certain activities of the Greater New York committee.

In early November, the national committee of SANE directed the Greater New York committee to surrender its charter. The motion also recommended that existing local groups which desire to apply for a charter should communicate with the national office.

In publishing the record, I again wish to make it emphatically clear that there has never been any question about the bona fides of the distinguished Americans who constitute the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy. I also wish to point out that this testimony relates to the situation that existed in the Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, not in the National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy which has taken energetic steps to cope with the problem.

The national committee of SANE is to be complimented on the measures it has taken. It would be misleading and dangerous, however, to believe that, with these actions, the problem of Communist infiltration has ceased to exist. The problem is widespread; if the Communists, under direction, have infiltrated the local organizations of SANE in the New York area, it can be taken for granted that there has been a parallel infiltration in varying degrees, in other centers. The problem is also a continuous one because the Communists are without question the world's most persistent infiltrators. They can be abused and disinvited—but if they see something to gain from infiltrating a non-Communist organization, on a local or national scale, they will employ every resource and artifice to do so.

In my initial speech on the Communist infiltration in the nuclear test ban movement I discussed the possible need for legislation to assist private organizations in coping with the problem of Communist infiltration. The national committee of SANE has taken the stand that it is entirely capable of dealing with the Communist infiltration in its ranks and preventing the subversion of its principles by the Soviet termites. For my own part, I am inclined to agree with the national committee that Government intervention and regulation is to be avoided wherever possible, and that it would be infinitely preferable if SANE and other organizations can demonstrate their ability to resist Communist infiltration with their own resources.

It is my hope that over the coming period the national committee of SANE will, by the example in which it is now engaged demonstrate that legislation is not needed. For my own part, I am disposed to give the committee an appropriate period of time in which to prove its point.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an analysis of the testimony of the witnesses on the Greater New York Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ANALYSIS OF TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES ON THE GREATER NEW YORK COMMITTEE FOR A SANE NUCLEAR POLICY

Witnesses heard on Aug. 31, Sept. 1-2, and Oct. 10, 1960.....	25
Witnesses heard in previous testimony (Henry H. Abrams, Alexander Munsell, Halstead Holman).....	3
Number heard Aug. 31, Sept. 1-2, and Oct. 10, 1960, who took the fifth amendment.....	22
Number of above who refused to answer (John W. Darr, Jr.).....	1
Number previously heard who took the fifth amendment (Henry H. Abrams, Alexander Munsell, Halstead Holman).....	3
Number heard Aug. 31, Sept. 1-2, Oct. 10, 1960, who took the fifth amendment and were local chairmen (Saul Arons, Mrs. Rose Holly, Mrs. Laura Naddell, Thomas Saligman, Ralph Shapiro, Joseph Spencer, Mrs. Sarah Starr, Jeanette Sussman, Leonard Zablów).....	9
Number who testified previously, took the fifth amendment and was local chairman (Henry H. Abrams).....	1
Number who testified on Aug. 31, Sept. 1-2 and Oct. 10, 1960, who took the fifth amendment and were members of the Greater New York committee (Mrs. Beatrice Bergen, Maurice Kurzman, Mrs. Naomi Pastor).....	3
Number who contributed to the Greater New York committee or supported it in other ways, and who took the fifth amendment (Frederick Palmer Weber, Gerald Michael Covic, Dr. Joseph B. Furst, Carl A. Marzani, Victor Rabinowitz, John Randolph, Milton Rosen, Randolph B. Smith, Mrs. Margaret Cowl).....	10
Number previously heard who contributed to the Greater New York committee or supported it in other ways, and who took the fifth amendment (Halstead Holman, Alexander Munsell).....	2

<sup>1</sup> Not included in either total is Arnold Johnson, legislative director of the Communist Party, who invoked the fifth amendment in reply to most questions. Johnson, who is not a member of SANE, was called before the committee for the purpose of establishing that the Communist Party has made it a deliberate policy to infiltrate its members into such organizations.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 10(a), Public Law 474, 81st Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. HALEY, of Florida, Mr. MORRIS, of New Mexico, and Mr. BERRY, of South Dakota as members of the Joint Committee on Navajo-Hopi Indian Administration on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 46 U.S.C. 1126c, the Speaker had appointed Mr. HOLTZMAN, of New York, and Mr. MCINTIRE, of Maine as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions, of 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. BAILEY, of West Virginia, Mr. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania, Mr. BETTS,

of Ohio, and Mr. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 6, Public Law 754, 81st Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, as a member of the National Historical Publications Commission on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 106, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, Mr. BROOKS, of Louisiana, Mr. JONES, of Alabama, Mr. CURTIS, of Massachusetts, and Mr. BOW, of Ohio, as members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Construction of a Building for a Museum of History and Technology for the Smithsonian Institution on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86-650, the Speaker had appointed Mr. BYRNE, of Pennsylvania, Mr. DELANEY, of New York, and Mr. TABER, of New York as members of the U.S. Constitution One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary Commission on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 523, 78th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas, Mr. LANKFORD, of Maryland, and Mr. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, as members of the National Memorial Stadium Commission on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 715a, the Speaker had appointed Mr. KARSTEN, of Missouri, and Mr. GAVIN, of Pennsylvania, as members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 601, title VI, Public Law 250, 77th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MILLS, of Arkansas, Mr. KING, of California, Mr. MASON, of Illinois, Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, Mr. MAHON, of Texas, and Mr. TABER, of New York, as members of the Committee To Investigate Nonessential Federal Expenditures on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 372, 84th Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts, Mr. KEOGH, of New York, Mrs. ST. GEORGE, of New York, and Mr. SCHENK, of Ohio, as members of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 20 U.S.C. 42, 43, the Speaker had appointed Mr. CANNON, of Missouri, Mr. BROOKS, of Louisiana, and Mr. BOW, of Ohio, as members of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 14 U.S.C. 194(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. DADDARIO, of Connecticut,

and Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, of Michigan, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Coast Guard Academy on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 5, Public Law 420, 83d Congress, the Speaker had appointed Mr. THORNBERRY, of Texas, and Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey, as members of the Board of Directors of Gallaudet College on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 2(a), Public Law 85-874, the Speaker had appointed Mr. WRIGHT, of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON, of New Jersey, and Mr. KEARNS, of Pennsylvania, as members ex officio of the Board of Trustees of the National Cultural Center on the part of the House.

The message further informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. TEAGUE, of Texas, Mr. RABAUT, of Michigan, Mr. RIEHLMAN, of New York, and Mr. JONAS, of North Carolina, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy on the part of the House.

The message also informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), the Speaker had appointed Mr. ROGERS, of Colorado, Mr. MAGNUSON, of Washington, Mr. CHENOWETH, of Colorado, and Mr. OSTERTAG, of New York, as members of the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy on the part of the House.

#### FEED GRAINS PROGRAM FOR 1961

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 54, Senate bill 993, and that it be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 993) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, notwithstanding any other provision of law—

(a) the level of price support for the 1961 crop of corn shall be \$1.20 per bushel; and the level of price support for the 1961 crops of oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums shall be such level as the Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter called the Secretary) determines is fair and reasonable in relation to the level of price support for corn, taking into consideration the feeding value of such commodity in relation to corn and the following additional factors: (1) the supply of the commodity in relation to the demand therefor, (2) the price levels at which other commodities are being supported, (3) the availability of funds, (4) the perishability of the commodity, (5) the importance of the commodity to agriculture and the national economy, (6) the ability to dispose of stocks acquired through a price-support operation, (7) the need for offsetting tempo-

rary losses of export markets, and (8) the ability and willingness of producers to keep supplies in line with demand.

(b) corn, oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums of the 1961 crop shall be eligible for price support only if—

(1) the total acreage on the farm devoted to the 1961 crops of corn and grain sorghums does not exceed the average acreage on the farm devoted to such commodities in 1959 and 1960, 30 per centum thereof;

(2) the total acreage on the farm devoted to the 1961 crops of such other feed grains as the Secretary may designate does not exceed the average acreage on the farm devoted to such commodities for harvest in 1959 and 1960, less 30 per centum thereof;

(3) the total acreage on the farm devoted to the production of nonconserving crops as determined by the Secretary which would normally be harvested in 1961 does not exceed the total average annual acreage on the farm devoted to the production of such nonconserving crops for harvest in 1959 and 1960, less the sum of the reductions in feed grain acreages required by clauses (1) and (2) (such sum being hereinafter called the required reduction); and

(4) the producers on the farm in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture—

(i) devote an acreage on the farm equal to the required reduction to soil and water conserving uses, and

(ii) do not produce any crop thereon which is normally harvested in 1961 and do not graze such acreage during such year.

The Secretary may permit a reduction in corn and grain sorghums acreage in excess of the 30 per centum required under clause (1) to be counted toward any reduction required under clause (2) on such basis as he determines will result in a comparable reduction in acreage in terms of feed value. The acreage described in clause (4) shall be in addition to any acreage devoted to the conservation reserve program. In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the acreage of corn, grain sorghums, other feed grains designated by the Secretary, and other nonconserving crops for harvest in 1959 and 1960 may be adjusted to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate for abnormal weather conditions, established crop rotation practices for the farm, changes in the constitution of the farm, participation in soil bank or Great Plains programs, or to give effect to the provisions of law relating to release and reapportionment or preservation of history, and such other factors as the Secretary may deem appropriate. For the purposes of eligibility for price support a producer shall not be deemed to have violated any of the foregoing conditions unless the producer knowingly violated such condition, but the Secretary may provide by regulation for adjusting any payment under subsection (c) on account of any violation of any such condition or any other condition of eligibility for such payment.

(c) Producers meeting the foregoing conditions of eligibility for price supports shall be entitled for the number of acres of each commodity (corn, or grain sorghums, or other feed grain designated by the Secretary) represented in the required reduction to—

(1) A cash payment computed by multiplying one-half of such number of acres by the average annual yield of such commodity by 50 per centum of the basic county support rate for such commodity, and

(2) A payment in kind equal in value to an amount computed by multiplying one-half of such number of acres by the average annual yield of such commodity by 60 per centum of the basic county support rate for such commodity.

For the purposes of this subsection the average annual yield of each commodity shall be the average annual yield per harvested acre on the farm for the years 1959 and 1960,



adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and other factors as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary. The basic county support rate shall be the 1961 crop basic support rate, as determined by the Secretary, for the county in which the acreage described in subsection (b)(4) is located. The payment in kind shall be made by the issuance of a negotiable certificate which Commodity Credit Corporation shall redeem in feed grains equal in value to the value of the certificate. The feed grains redeemable for such certificate shall be valued at the market price thereof as determined by the Commodity Credit Corporation. In the case of any certificate not redeemed within sixty days of the date of its issuance, reasonable costs of storage and other carrying charges, as determined by the Secretary, for the period beginning sixty days after its issuance and ending with the date of its redemption shall be deducted from the value of the certificate. The Commodity Credit Corporation shall provide assistance in the marketing of such certificates. The Secretary shall provide by regulations for the sharing of payments under this subsection among producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis.

Sec. 2. (a) The Secretary is authorized to issue such regulations as may be necessary to effectuate the program authorized by this Act.

(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act. Obligations may be incurred in advance of appropriations therefor and Commodity Credit Corporation is authorized to advance from its capital funds such sums as may be necessary to pay administrative expenses in connection with this act during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1961.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. While a good many Senators are present in the Chamber, I should like to say that the majority leader and I have had some discussions about the rest of the week and possibly into the following week. The feed grains bill will be the business before the Senate. I am not certain, because of the fact that the House has not yet completed action on a similar bill, whether there will be action on the bill today, but I would fancy there will be no vote on it until tomorrow. That is the first inquiry I should like to make.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the parliamentary inquiry may be clarified without my losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Illinois that it is my purpose to present the bill, to let us have debate on it, but to await the action in the House before we actually vote on either the pending bill or a substitution of the House bill.

I am informed that the House will probably pass its bill sometime this afternoon, and if that occurs early

enough and we are through with debate, the Senate could substitute the House bill for whatever Senate bill we had agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the distinguished minority leader will yield, and complementing what the Senator from Louisiana has said, it would be my suggestion that we follow the procedure outlined by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. If it is possible, we should try to dispose of the debate on the bill today and agree to a vote on it tomorrow.

Following consideration of the feed grains bill, it is anticipated we will bring up the depressed areas bill, which should be made the unfinished business tomorrow. I hope there will be no objection. The bill could be debated at least in part and then carried over until Friday, at which time it might be possible to conclude consideration of that particular measure.

Following that would come consideration of the extension of unemployment compensation benefits, on which hearings were held this morning in the Committee on Finance. I understand the hearings will continue tomorrow. It would appear that the best possible date for bringing up of that particular piece of proposed legislation—and it is very important legislation—would be Monday. If that is the case, it is also contemplated that immediately after passage of the bill reported by the Committee on Finance the Senate will consider the extension of railway unemployment compensation, which has already passed the House unanimously.

After that it would be in order to bring up the OECD Treaty, which has been reported from the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations unanimously and which I think is in a form which should meet the satisfaction of a great majority of the Members of this body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me follow that up a moment. I should like to ask the Senator from Louisiana with respect to the possibility of amendments as to which there may be votes. My understanding is, from the statement of the majority leader, that there will be a general discussion of the feed grains bill today but no vote either on substantial amendments or on the bill itself until tomorrow.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have obtained the information that the House expects to complete action on its bill about 4 o'clock this afternoon. If the House bill is sent to us we can finish consideration of the feed grains bill today. That is my hope.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am not advised as to how many Senators wish to discuss the bill, but I am sure there will be a good deal of discussion, and I would not like to have to remain too late.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would not be my purpose to cut off discussion. We will permit Senators to discuss the bill as much as they wish.

Mr. President, I believe we should take action on the feed grains bill as soon as possible. I had hoped we could put the feed grains bill on the President's desk sometime this week. If we wait until

next week, after the 15th, we might as well not pass a bill. That is why I am so anxious to present the bill today and wait to see what the House is going to do at about 4 o'clock. If we are through discussing the bill and acting on the Senate bill we can take up the House bill and substitute our bill for the House bill, and send it to conference immediately. That is what perhaps can be done.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to continue on that point. If that is possible, I think we ought to do it, and we should be prepared to remain here until 7 o'clock, if need be.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be my suggestion, Mr. President. We should act on the feed grains bill as soon as possible.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Louisiana that it is certainly not my disposition to delay action on the bill any longer than is necessary. I only wish to see that Members are alerted as to when they can expect to consider the depressed areas bill, the OECD Treaty and the temporary unemployment compensation bill. Also, because of commitments which have been made by a good many Members to make speeches and that sort of thing in their home States, I hope there will be no Saturday session. I think the majority leader would concur in that, insofar as he can contrive it. I do not ask him for an outright assurance on that point, but it seems to me we can negotiate the schedule so as to be free on Saturday, and I do not think it would offend any Member of the Senate on either side of the aisle if that is consummated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I say to the Senator from Illinois, if it had been possible to bring up an extension of the unemployment compensation benefits bill, both as it applies to the social security system and to the Railway Labor Act, by Saturday, we would have attempted to consider it, as we had previously intimated. In view of the fact that hearings will be held tomorrow, it seems unlikely that the measure will be before us. I, too, hope we can finish the other business and adjourn from Friday until Monday.

Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. PASTORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The Senator from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I will yield, for one more question, to my distinguished friend from Rhode Island, and then I will not yield further.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I understood the majority leader to say that he expects to bring up the depressed areas bill on Friday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. We expect to bring the bill up tomorrow and have debate on it, and it will probably go over until Friday. The bill will be placed before the Senate tomorrow, as soon as we finish with the feed grains bill.

Mr. PASTORE. If consideration of the depressed areas bill is not concluded by Friday night, does the Senator expect we shall have a Saturday session?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Let us wait to see what happens at that time.

Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield to me?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I must, of course, yield to the distinguished majority leader, so I retract my previous statement. Then I shall decline to yield further.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

#### A TRIBUTE TO MARGARET MITCHELL AND METRO-GOLDWYN-MAYER'S "GONE WITH THE WIND"

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, wherever men speak in any tongue, the work of Margaret Mitchell in that great book, "Gone With the Wind," has been read and discussed. It was translated into 24 languages and had over 70 printings, and over 10 million volumes have been printed and sold. The motion picture, "Gone With the Wind," has been viewed by some 60 million people.

A brief tribute to this great publication and to this great picture has been prepared, inasmuch as this is the year in which the country celebrates the 100th anniversary of the Civil War, and I ask unanimous consent that the tribute may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A TRIBUTE TO MARGARET MITCHELL AND METRO-GOLDWYN-MAYER'S "GONE WITH THE WIND"

The presentation of this most famous of all motion pictures has been timed to coincide with the 100th anniversary of the Civil War. This Civil War centennial extends over a 5-year period, 1961-65, corresponding of course, with the years of the war, 1861-65. Hundreds of reenactments, tributes, commemorations, dedications, and activities are being scheduled.

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer is now making elaborate plans for the anniversary premiere of the filmization of Georgia's own Margaret Mitchell's "Gone With the Wind." The premiere of the picture will be held on March 10 at Loew's Grand Theater in Atlanta, the same city and the same theater where the original premiere was held. As near as possible, the entire schedule of activities that were held in 1939 are being duplicated this time. From the original cast Vivien Leigh, Olivia de Havilland, Thomas Mitchell, and other stars are to be in attendance, including the famed producer David O. Selznick. In Washington, D.C., the film will be shown at Loew's Capitol Theater on March 30.

Margaret Mitchell and her famous novel that was made into this great motion picture that captured the imagination of the world will be honored on this occasion, and this is most appropriate.

"Gone With the Wind" has played in practically every city in the world, including those behind the Iron Curtain, where seized prints are exhibited. Its record-breaking aggregate audience totals more than 120 million people and it has been shown somewhere every day since it first opened 21 years ago. It won a then unprecedented 10 Academy Awards, including the Thalberg Award given to Producer Selznick for most consistent high quality of production.

Clark Gable became Hollywood's "King" as a result of his portrayal as Rhett Butler. The picture also proved a turning point in the careers of Vivien Leigh, who won an "Oscar" as best actress of the year for her role as Scarlett, Olivia de Havilland, and Leslie Howard.

Although the Academy Awards are recognized as the final accolade, there were many other honors and tributes. At opposite ends of the pole, for example, Winston Churchill sent a personal message of congratulations and Adolph Hitler seized a print and ran it over and over for his personal pleasure.

It was released in England during the Battle of Britain and moviegoers queued up at the box office, ignoring the Nazi bombs. It missed playing 4 years in two theaters in London by only 7 weeks. Its longest continuous run was in Paris, where it played for 3 years and 11 months.

"Gone With the Wind" runs 3 hours and 40 minutes. The final edited film contains 19,980 feet, just short of 4 miles long. More prints have been made than of any picture in history. Concurrently with the record-shattering success of the film has been the success of Margaret Mitchell's novel. The original hard-cover edition consisted of 1,037 pages. It sold 50,000 copies the first day it was issued, shattering all fiction records. It won the Pulitzer Prize, and was declared the most distinguished novel of the year by the American Booksellers Association.

Since first issued, it has had over 70 printings, and has been translated into 24 languages. The paperback edition, running 862 pages, was first issued in 1954. It has since had two other printings with the most recent, in early 1960, selling 706,199 copies. Counting all editions, it is estimated that the book has sold more than 6 million copies in this country, and some 10 million in all nations. It is recommended reading in many schools as a book which, like the picture, tells of a glorious and dramatic epoch in our history.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR HOWARD W. CANNON, OF NEVADA

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, my distinguished colleague and warm friend added another chapter to his illustrious career yesterday when the Senate unanimously approved his nomination by President Kennedy to be a brigadier general in the U.S. Air Force Reserve.

Senator HOWARD CANNON entered the service of his country as a first lieutenant in 1941 and had attained the rank of lieutenant colonel at the time of his separation in 1946. What transpired in those years, Mr. President, provides eloquent testimony to the caliber of the man who now sits with us in this great deliberative body.

During a fierce air battle over Holland, his plane was riddled by hostile gunfire and he parachuted to safety far behind the enemy lines. With the aid of valiant underground partisans and his own keen wits, he managed to elude capture by the Nazis and—42 long days later—safely reached the Allied lines.

Among his numerous military decorations are the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Purple Heart, the European Theater ribbon with eight battle stars, and the French Croix de Guerre with silver star.

At war's end, Senator CANNON resumed the practice of law in Las Vegas, and served for more than 10 years as that city's chief legal officer. The press of business, however, never diminished his enthusiasm for the military, and he immediately became active in the Air Force Reserve, serving as the commanding officer of his hometown unit.

As a colonel in the Reserve, he has flown most of the Air Force jet aircraft, including the B-58 Hustler bomber, at speeds exceeding 1,300 miles per hour. He has logged more than 3,500 military flying hours, and at least 2,000 flying hours in civilian aircraft.

Upon entering the U.S. Senate, he was assigned to the Armed Services and Aeronautical and Space Science Committees, and plunged into his duties with characteristic enthusiasm and vigor. Senator CANNON has maintained his Reserve status, and at present has a mobilization designation as assistant to Lt. Gen. Bernard Shriever, commander, Headquarters ARDC, Andrews Air Force Base, Md.

Mr. President, Nevada is proud of Senator CANNON, and I know that the Members of this body share that pride in his splendid accomplishments. His elevation to general officer rank moves him into a select company in the Senate, shared also by our distinguished colleagues, the junior Senators from Arizona and South Carolina.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I join the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada in congratulating one of our colleagues, Senator HOWARD CANNON, on his attainment of the rank of brigadier general in the Air Force. Many think of the Senate as being an older body, but I think it is high time that we demonstrate our capability of meeting the supersonic age by having within our body not one jet pilot but two jet pilots, one for each of the two major parties.

I think it is a distinct privilege to be allowed to serve with a man who is so familiar with and who understands so well the problems of our air age and our necessary defense capabilities.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I am happy to join the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] in congratulating our friend Senator HOWARD CANNON. I had not realized that he was about to be elevated in rank in the Air Force.

I have had the pleasure of serving on the Armed Services Committee with him since he came to the Senate. I have observed his unusual knowledge of the problems of the Armed Forces and his conscientious approach to many difficult decisions that have faced our committee since he has been a member of that committee. I am bound to say that he has added a great deal to our understanding of these problems. I feel that he has been very wise and forthright in his decisions, partially as a result of his extraordinary service in the Air Force of the United States. So I take this opportunity to join Senators in enthusiastic congratulations to HOWARD CANNON.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have the distinction—perhaps an unenviable one—of being the oldest ex-Air Force officer in this body, one whose success varied very greatly from that of our distinguished colleague, Senator HOWARD CANNON, in that the highest rank I ever



attained was that of captain back in World War I.

I wish to say for the RECORD on the floor of the Senate that I do here what I have already done in the cloakroom with great pride as an ex-captain of the Air Force. I have saluted our latest general officer of the Air Force Reserve with all compliments and congratulations to him, and to the great State which he represents so well.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I too, wish to join my colleagues in offering heartiest congratulations to the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] on his promotion to brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. Senator CANNON is indeed deserving of his star, having served with great distinction in the Air Force in war and in peace.

For his courage and bravery in action during World War II, he was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, the Air Medal with two Oak Leaf Clusters, and the French Croix de Guerre with Silver Star.

Not content to serve his country only in wartime, he has continued his active participation in the Air Force. Over the intervening years, our Air Force has become the most powerful striking force on earth—and a true shield and protector of America and the free world. He has been part and parcel of this marvelous growth.

Last May I had the privilege of serving with the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada as representatives of the Senate to the 150th anniversary of the independence of Argentina. I was selected to go because in 1819 Hawaii, as a sovereign nation, was the first nation to recognize Argentine independence. The junior Senator from Nevada served as a delegate from the Senate with great distinction and honor. It was my privilege to serve with him as a representative at that independence gathering. It is also my privilege to serve with him now as a Reserve officer in the Reserve Corps. As a colonel in the Air Force Reserve, I salute him, and wish him luck, Godspeed, and all that goes with it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I congratulate not only the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] for the promotion which he has so well earned, but also the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE] for bringing this attainment to the attention of the Senate and giving us an opportunity to pay tribute to our colleague, who has earned this recognition so well.

As a groundborne officer of World War II, I remember that the ground forces looked with awe on the Air Force with all the glamor, speed and accomplishments the Air Force attained.

But here is one Air Force officer whose attainment I am not surprised to see. I think he is the most versatile general I have ever known in my military or civilian experience. Not only has he won decorations for heroism in combat and attained a fine record, but also he was a brilliant trial lawyer in Nevada before he came to the Senate. In Texas I used to hear of him.

He is an accomplished musician. He can play instruments alone, or as a mem-

ber of a band. Before he finished college he broke wild horses on the ranches of Nevada in order to earn sufficient money to attend college. He can ride horses, cutting horses in the arena with the best of the cowboys. He is an accomplished rider, an accomplished musician, and he has now earned the rank of general. He has received that star by earning it. We know of his fine record in the Senate. He is a man of so many accomplishments, that he honors the Senate by his presence here. I am glad to be one who has the privilege of paying him this honor.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, I join in congratulating Senator HOWARD CANNON for the high honor which has so deservedly come to him. As has already been pointed out by several members, he has had a remarkable military career. He is in the full vigor and prime of his life.

I am sure a call to active duty would be welcomed by him at any time. He would perform any duty that was assigned to him with great diligence and with great devotion to his country.

I should like to give my friend HOWARD CANNON, one word of caution. If in his official biography, it is shown that he is a brigadier general, I suggest to him that he insert alongside that he also was a GI, because in introductions at political meetings, sometimes it is of more value to have served as an enlisted man than it is to hold the high rank which he has now so justly achieved.

We all wish him well. We hope he will not be called to active duty and leave us holding the bag here in the Senate. We who serve with him enjoy his company and the warmth of his personality. We know also that the Air Force has acted wisely in making him a brigadier general.

Mr. MCGEE. Mr. President, I wish to join my voice to those paying tribute to our colleague the junior Senator from Nevada, HOWARD CANNON. I express the pride of the West. We like to share in his attainments because we feel an affinity of interest, and hope that that carries over in an affinity toward his attainments. I likewise suggest that as a son of the West, he is also a member of the class of 1958 in this body. He has been our star 10, these 2-plus years, and we have followed that star for guidance in our deliberations. We are delighted that the military has now officially given him the star that we have long since recognized, and we pay tribute to him here today.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am very happy to offer my congratulations to my Senate twin, HOWARD CANNON. Many times we have been confused in identity in this body and elsewhere. I shall take a little extra pride now in being mistaken for HOWARD CANNON, because he is a general and well deserving of the accolade.

HOWARD CANNON is a native son of Utah, and I take great pride in that fact. He was serving as an elected official in my State of Utah when he went into the service of his country.

As has been recounted, he distinguished himself there, and has since then continued in his military efforts to

the point where he has now received this well-deserved award. The junior Senator from New York touched on one point to which I believe I should also refer. He warned HOWARD about the problem of mixing political life and military life, and that it can be hazardous. I remember the story of an election that was held in the South after the Civil War. The very distinguished General Beauregard was running for election to Congress against a man named J. T. Buck, as I remember. The two of them were out on the hustings. The general was speaking and he said that he had been at Shiloh, had been at the Wilderness, had been at Seven Pines, and so forth. This man Buck felt less and less confident as the general went on. When his turn finally came he said, "Well, I was at Shiloh, but I did not sleep in a tent. I was at the Wilderness, but I did not have a messhall to go to. I just want you to know that I think the general is a great general and I am proud to have been with him. In fact, I think he is such a great man that I recommend that all the generals in the crowd vote for him, and all those who were privates vote for me."

I want to give that warning to HOWARD.

HOWARD, we are tremendously proud of your accomplishment and of the well-deserved recognition which your promotion represents. All of us wish you well. We know that you will continue to serve with distinction not only in the Senate, but also in the Air Force Reserve.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, this occasion gives us an opportunity not only to extend our warm congratulations to our colleague, Senator CANNON, on his promotion to the rank of general in the Air Force, but—and I feel that I speak for all Senators when I say this—it also refreshes my own confidence in the military. I am not suggesting that I have not always had confidence in the military. However, when a man like Senator CANNON is promoted to general, my faith in the ability and wisdom of the men who run the Air Force is strengthened.

I was not privileged to know the general prior to my coming to the Senate. However, I have been privileged to serve with him on one of the important committees of the Senate, the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences. The first time HOWARD CANNON spoke in a meeting of that committee I said to myself, "Here is an unusual man. Here is a man of great ability, a man of great intellect, who obviously knows what he is talking about." HOWARD CANNON has fully justified that first judgment. He has made a very great contribution to the work of the committee and of the Senate. Everyone in the country who knows of him will feel better today to know that a man of Senator CANNON's record and ability is now one of our generals in the Air Force Reserve. I congratulate him, and I congratulate the Air Force and the Defense Department on having in its ranks a man of the stature and caliber of HOWARD CANNON.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I wish to add my congratulations on this occasion. I have always had great admiration for the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada, Brig. Gen. HOWARD W. CANNON. We are glad to felicitate him today. The citizens of Nevada honored themselves in electing HOWARD CANNON to the Senate. I am a humble Member of the Senate class of 1958 to which reference has been made. I am one of the 16 Democratic Members of the Senate who were elected in November 1958 and who were sworn in as Senators on January 7, 1959. It was on that day that I first met Senator CANNON, of Nevada.

As was said, we truly pinned a star on his shoulder shortly after that time, because from that day to the present he has been a leader of our group in the Senate. We have looked to him with admiration and affection throughout the more than 2 years that have elapsed.

It was for me a very happy occasion indeed when I learned yesterday that I was privileged, with other Senators, to vote for his confirmation as a general officer of the Air Force Reserve. The Air Force has honored itself by promoting this fine combat soldier to the rank of brigadier general.

It is evident he was brave in combat. To those who serve with him in the Senate of the United States, it is evident he is a truly great Senator and a man of remarkable modesty.

While I pay deserved tribute to him, at the same time I extend my fervent congratulations to the citizens of Nevada who have him as their Senator alongside their distinguished senior Senator [Mr. BIBLE].

HOWARD W. CANNON has a distinguished record of service to his country in war and in peace. I wish Gen. HOWARD CANNON, Senator CANNON, and the State of Nevada Godspeed and happy landings in all things.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, as each successive tribute was being paid, I realized that the adjectives and nouns which I had intended to employ were being used more fruitfully than I would have been able to utter them. Therefore, perhaps I should pitch my remarks on a less dramatic note.

Heretofore my greatest source of credit at home—parenthetically, we have eight children, with the oldest now being 13—has been the fact that I sit next to a Senator from Alaska. This seemed to have been an incredible performance and a great tribute to father. The fact that I sit also in a Chamber which at one time included the present President of the United States, the present Vice President, and the many distinguished men and women who have sat in this body, registered not at all with most of these children.

I anticipate with great delight, on returning home tonight, telling these children that I now sit between a Senator from Alaska and a general in the Air Force. For all the reasons heretofore assigned I am proud of HOWARD CANNON, and for this additional reason also.

Finally, in complete seriousness, if my children are to look to a man other

than father for character guidance, I am completely satisfied that they look to HOWARD CANNON.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have had the rare privilege of sitting beside HOWARD CANNON both in the Senate and in the Committee on Armed Services ever since he came to the Senate.

I wish to congratulate him and his country on his well merited promotion to the rank of brigadier general. As one who has had ample opportunity to observe him since he came to the Senate, I bear testimony to the people of his State of Nevada that he is serving his country in the Senate with the same courage and the same devotion with which he served his country in combat in the Second World War.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I did not know the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada before he became a Member of the Senate. Since he came here I have had the pleasure of serving with him on the Armed Services Committee. I have found him to be one of the ablest and best informed members of the committee.

The junior Senator from Nevada has made a very fine record in military service, and he has also established an outstanding record of service in civilian life. The State of Nevada and our country can be proud of men of his caliber.

Having been a reservist for over 32 years, I know some of the sacrifices HOWARD CANNON has made. On many nights when people are watching television or going to the theater or staying at home relaxing, reservists are out training, trying to prepare themselves to defend their country, if the need arises. On many weekends, when others are going to the beaches or to other places of enjoyment, reservists are spending their time in training for their country, in the event they should be called.

I am proud of the friendship of the junior Senator from Nevada. I am proud of his accomplishments, and I am very much pleased that he has been promoted to the rank of brigadier general. I extend to him my heartiest congratulations.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have just learned the news of the promotion of Senator HOWARD CANNON to the rank of brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. This news gave me not only much pleasure, but it was received with the sense which all such news always confers upon one who has never achieved a rank in the military service higher than that of first lieutenant.

I think Senators from the Western States will testify that in many legislative matters we are already used to taking our marching orders from HOWARD CANNON. Now I think we shall probably take them with less backtalk than before.

All of us commend Senator CANNON and rejoice with him. I extend to him my very sincere congratulations. I think the Air Force, too, is to be congratulated for the discrimination it has shown in giving this well-deserved recognition.

Mr. SMITH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I join with my colleagues in congratulating the junior Senator from Nevada on his promotion. It is well deserved, and a credit to both the Armed Forces and the Senate.

In my brief service here, I have come to know that Senator CANNON is one of the ablest Members of this body. I know that in his new position he will continue to serve our country with distinction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I add my congratulations to the many already extended on the promotion to brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve of our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON].

It is a fitting tribute to his long and productive service in our country's Armed Forces and to his outstanding heroic feats performed during the last World War. I am exceedingly happy that my distinguished colleague received this highly merited appointment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it was some months that we served together before I knew that HOWARD CANNON was a pilot; and some months more before I knew of his outstanding battle record in the defense of his country. I only mention this because it is typical of the man. He is one of the most modest great men it has been my privilege to know.

His records in the service have been presented well on the floor; but I should like to join with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] in commending the Senator from Nevada for the work he does in committee. There is no member of the Committee on Armed Services who is more diligent, or more wise, or more constructive. Therefore, it is a great privilege to have the opportunity to serve with the Senator from Nevada, and I know these are the feelings of persons in the Air Force who also consider it a great privilege to serve with this American patriot.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MUSKIE in the chair). Will the Senator from Nevada yield to the Chair?

Mr. BIBLE. It is a privilege to yield to the Presiding Officer, the distinguished junior Senator from Maine.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that as the temporary Presiding Officer, he does not lose the privilege of the floor, so he should like to say that it has been a pleasure and a privilege to preside over the Senate while these tributes were being paid to the junior Senator from Nevada.

The Chair wishes to recall to the Senator from Nevada that during the campaign of 1958 he had the privilege of flying in the Senator's plane, with the Senator from Nevada as the pilot. The Chair can attest that the Senator from Nevada not only knows where he is going, but also knows with pinpoint accuracy the country over which he is flying.

It gives the Chair great pride and pleasure to join with other Senators in paying tribute to the junior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.



Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I certainly would not want to miss the opportunity to share in this wonderful occasion, and to commend a very fine U.S. Senator, a truly splendid man, and a friend to all of us.

I am one of the underprivileged Members of this body. I have not had the opportunity to sit alongside Senator HOWARD CANNON. I have had to be somewhat, at least, physically removed from him, although not spiritually and politically.

The great honor which has come to the junior Senator from Nevada by being made a general of the Air Force is, indeed, something which he well deserved. It is an honor not only to himself and to his State, but also to this body. Some of the tributes which have been paid to the Senator from Nevada today are notable ones within themselves.

When the Senator from Nevada and his family have an opportunity to read what has been said about him today, I feel certain that it will be a source of genuine pleasure and of many happy memories in the years ahead.

I salute my good friend. I wish him well. He not only flies well and flies high, but he knows exactly where he is going, and when he gets there he knows where he is.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there is little that can be added to what Senators have said today about the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada, who now is also a general. However, it is a pleasure to join with the Presiding Officer, with the first Secretary of the Air Force, with the majority whip, with the Senator's colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], and all other Senators, to pay our respects to HOWARD CANNON, a man who has made his mark in the Senate; a man who is known for his determination, his humility, his sense of understanding, and his sense of tolerance.

In honoring HOWARD CANNON, the Air Force has also honored the Senate; and by honoring the Senate, the Air Force has doubly honored the State of Nevada, as well.

So I am delighted to join with all Senators in congratulating the distinguished junior Senator from Nevada upon his most merited award.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I am happy to join with other Senators in honoring HOWARD CANNON. We who have served with him on the Committee on Armed Services know of the wise counsel and advice which he always has available for the committee and its members. He has demonstrated, time and again, that his vast experience, both as a Reserve officer and in the long time he served on active duty in World War II, has been invaluable to the committee in making important decisions.

On the lighter side, even if he is a brigadier general in the Air Force, he has established the fact that he can be

most objective in dealing with the problems of the other sister services.

We are proud that HOWARD CANNON has been promoted from colonel to brigadier general in the Air Force.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona, who is himself a pilot and an outstanding brigadier general in the Air Force.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, I wish to compliment my friend, HOWARD CANNON, upon his promotion to the rank of brigadier general in the Air Force Reserve. Having been a reservist myself for more than 30 years, I have watched with great interest the way in which he has applied himself to the rather difficult job, at times, of keeping up his Reserve status. I know that before he became a Member of the Senate, his M-day assignment at Nellis Air Force Base was very assiduously taken care of.

I know his commanding officer very well, and spoke with him only the other night when he was in town to participate in the award of the Thompson Trophy.

HOWARD CANNON not only has kept up the requirements for promotion in the Air Force Reserve, in the matter of attending drills and corresponding work, but he is current in the flying of jet aircraft. I know that just recently he flew the B-58, which is our fastest small bomber. He does these things in addition to his Senate duties. I can say from experience that it is sometimes very difficult to do.

I am very happy to have General CANNON as my vice commander in the 9999th Air Force Reserve Squadron, which is a squadron of reservists who work on Capitol Hill.

General, I wish you all the luck in the world, and look forward to the time when that other star will fall from Heaven.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it is with great pleasure that I now yield to my distinguished junior colleague, the Senator-general from the State of Nevada. As I said earlier, the State of Nevada is mighty proud of him.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada and to many other colleagues in the Senate who have said so many kind things in my behalf. I am deeply grateful. I assure them that many of those comments are, I feel, undeserved.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

#### PRACTICAL PROOF OF THE WISDOM OF THE NATURAL RESOURCE MESSAGE OF PRESIDENT KENNEDY

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the natural resources message of President Kennedy, recently transmitted to the Congress, stated that—

Wise investment in a resource program today will return vast dividends tomorrow, and failure to act now may be opportunities lost forever.

In support of this observation, I bring to the attention of the Senate figures showing just some of the dividends which

have resulted from investments in water-resource projects in the State of Missouri.

The last 10 years have seen a rapid development of the Bull Shoals, Taney-como, and Table Rock areas, in the southern part of our State.

A recent survey showed the following facts about this area, the improvements being entirely the result of these developments:

	1950	1960
Banks:		
Bank deposits.....	\$2,400,000	\$0,000,000
Bank loans.....	\$900,000	\$4,515,000
Schools:		
Valuation of school district.....	\$1,813,895	\$4,806,485
School enrollment.....	652	860
Teachers.....	28	37
School levy.....	\$1.70	\$2.70
Chamber of Commerce budget.....	\$2,500	\$15,000

It is also interesting to note what happened in the counties surrounding this development.

All Missouri counties surrounding Taney County, where most of this development is taking place, lost population during the past 10 years, as follows:

	Percent
Stone County.....	-17.0
Ozark County.....	-24.8
Douglas County.....	-23.7
Christian County.....	-6.0

But Taney County showed a net gain of 3 percent; and practically all of it was concentrated around the new lake area in question.

In 1953, Weldon Stein, an economist with the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, estimated that tourist business brought approximately \$3.5 million income to the area. The present estimate is \$10 million.

Sixteen new motels are either under construction, or in the planning stage, on the 3-mile access road to Table Rock Lake. Owners of land in this vicinity recently themselves raised \$10,000 to pay for paving the road.

Large numbers of retired people have moved into this area. It is almost the equivalent of new industry. Three hundred people, with an average retirement income of \$5,000 each, are equivalent to an industry with a \$1,500,000 payroll.

One of the local residents is now studying retirement villages financed by insurance companies. These are complete villages, with from 500 to 4,000 homes in them. In the past 5 years, practically all major denominations have built new churches.

An average of more than 100,000 visitors monthly came to the new Table Rock State Park, the past summer. All facilities were almost continuously occupied.

One of the most significant indicators of more prosperity was the Table Rock land sale held by the Empire District Electric Co. in June of last year. Thirty-three hundred acres sold at auction, in 28 parcels, for \$422,000.

Conditions in the world being what they are today, I am proud to be identified with an administration that has the wisdom and the courage to invest in the future of America.

# LET'S GIVE THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE A CHANCE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the proposed emergency feed-grain program of the Department of Agriculture would have authorized the Secretary to sell feed grains at market prices. House bill 4510 contains a similar provision, authorizing the sale of corn and grain sorghums at a price not more than 17 percent below the 1961 support rate—about \$1.

The bill proposed by the Senate Agriculture Committee, however, deletes this provision, and that is unfortunate. Without it, it will not be possible to sell Government-owned feed grains into the market in the manner proposed by the Secretary.

I make these remarks with great respect for my former chairman, the senior Senator from Louisiana, a true authority on the problems of agriculture.

I favor the provision in H.R. 4510, or the one recommended by the Department of Agriculture, in order to provide the Department with greater leeway in its sales policy, and to assure complying producers a higher price than that received by noncompliers.

Mr. President, all of us who went through the turmoil in 1956 on the corn program realize what happens when a noncomplier is, in effect, given just about the same "arrangement" as given a complier at the beginning of the program. As I remember the figures, in 1956 those who complied with the corn program were given \$1.50. Those who did not were told they would receive nothing. But later they received \$1.25. Without discussing the reasons, I believe this incident had tragic implications. Thereafter less decided they wanted to go along with the program. They were going to get nearly as much in unit price if they produced as much corn as they could.

A provision of this type is vital to the success of the emergency feed-grain program. With planting dates rapidly approaching, there is no time to design a mandatory-type program and submit it to referendum.

It is, therefore, necessary to put into effect a program which will obtain a high degree of voluntary participation, and will not provide a price umbrella over noncooperators.

In that connection, let me say that those of us who have followed this program know that in the past a price umbrella has been provided over noncooperators. This is a grave problem.

The inclusion in the legislation of a provision of this type will serve as a strong incentive for producers to take part in the program, since at sign-up time they will know that the year's average market price will be below the support level.

It will obviously be to their advantage to take part in this voluntary program. The high degree of participation resulting from this provision will make support effective in increasing income for participating producers. The high degree of participation will also decrease production, and thereby will enable the Government to reduce its holding of

feed grains. Maintaining the market price below support levels will assure consumers of fair and stable prices for meat, poultry, and dairy products.

A feed-grain program which does not permit sales of Government-owned feed grains at a price near the current market level—and which permits an increase in support rates—will obtain only limited participation.

Such a feed-grain program, obtaining only limited participation, will make reduction of Government feed-grain holdings unlikely.

During recent years, grain production has been greater than requirements, and stocks have accumulated. Without substantial participation, it will be impossible to reduce production sufficiently below requirements to make inroads in total carryovers. Without substantial participation, there will be no reduction in CCC inventories and no reduction in today's burdensome storage and carrying costs.

To be effective therefore, emergency feed-grain legislation—which provides higher supports—must include a provision that will obtain a high degree of participation and thereby will, first, reduce the large stocks of feed grains; second, decrease excessive Government carrying charges; and third, increase income of participating producers, but without materially affecting feed grain, livestock, and consumer prices.

As stated, the provision the Secretary desires would authorize him to move Government stocks of feed grains into the market at approximately current market levels.

So let us get it on the record.

If giving the Secretary this permissive right is not approved, he will have little, if any, chance to reduce the current tremendous inventory of feed grains—2.4 billion bushels valued at \$4 billion—and he can operate only to the further disadvantage of the farmer, the consumer and the taxpayer.

Mr. President, let us pass a law which will give the Secretary of Agriculture a chance.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am glad to yield to the distinguished assistant majority leader.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to say to the Senator from Missouri that basically I concur in the observations he has made.

I have had made an analysis of the major provisions of the feed-grain program for 1961, the House bill and Report No. 29, and the Senate bill (S. 993) and Report No. 59. The analyzing compares the various provisions of the House bill and the Senate bill. At the conclusion of my remarks I shall request unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a table which indicates the differences between the House bill and the Senate bill.

The Senator from Missouri emphasizes, first of all, the need for an incentive to get feed-grain producers to come within the program, so as to reduce production.

Mr. SYMINGTON. That is correct.

Mr. HUMPHREY. The other point the Senator emphasizes is the power of

the Secretary of Agriculture to bring about compliance by having authority to sell into the market, at market prices, grains that are presently in the possession of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The fear of the Department in this matter is that, unless the so-called section 3 in the House bill is retained, producers might very well think that all corn is going to be \$1.20 a bushel, and other feed grains would have a related price according to their feed value or feed equivalent of corn, and that, therefore, the Government would find itself either buying up a large amount of the grain being produced or that the market price would drop so drastically that there would be real economic hardship in the world community.

I am hopeful that when the two bills go to conference some of these difficulties may be ironed out. I think the Senate bill has many commendable features. I shall vote for the Senate bill. It is my view, however, that when we make this kind of a piecemeal approach, which is what is being done here, since it is emergency legislation, we must give the Department the tools to do the job of bringing about a real balance between production and projected consumption.

COMPARISON OF THE HOUSE BILL AND THE SENATE BILL  
CCC SALES POLICY

Mr. President, H.R. 4510 authorizes, under section 3, CCC to sell feed grains at a price not less than 17 percent below the 1961 support price for such feed grains—that is, not less than 83 percent of the support price. The Senate bill contains no such provision; and, therefore, sales would need to be made under the existing authority.

H.R. 4510 provides the Department with greater leeway in a sales policy than currently exists so that the Department would have the authority to assure complying producers of a higher price than noncompliers. This is the way to get farmers to cooperate.

Inclusion of this type provision in the legislation will serve as a strong incentive for producers to take part in the program, since they would know at sign-up time that the year's average market price would be below the support level. It would obviously be to their advantage to take part in this voluntary program. The high degree of participation resulting from this provision will make support effective in increasing income for participating producers. The high degree of participation will also decrease production and thereby enable the Government to reduce its holdings of feed grains. Maintaining the market price below support levels will assure consumers of fair and stable prices for meat, poultry and dairy products.

A feed-grain program which does not permit sales of Government-owned feed grains at a price near the present market level—and which permits an increase in support rates—may obtain only limited participation.

Such a feed-grain program, obtaining only limited participation, will make reduction of Government feed-grain holdings unlikely. During recent years,



grain production has been greater than requirements and stocks have accumulated. Without substantial participation, it will be impossible to reduce production sufficiently below requirements to make inroads in total carryover. Without substantial participation, there will be no reduction in CCC inventories and no reduction in today's burdensome storage and carrying costs.

To be effective, therefore, emergency feed-grain legislation—which provides higher supports—must include provisions that will make it possible to obtain a high degree of participation, and thereby reduce the large stocks of feed grains, decrease excessive Government carrying charges, and increase income of participating producers, without materially affecting feed grain, livestock, and consumer prices.

**EFFECT ON PARTICIPATION OF REDUCTIONS REQUIRED FOR PRICE SUPPORT ELIGIBILITY**

H.R. 4510 requires producers, in order to be eligible for price support, to reduce their acreage of corn and grain

sorghums or any other feed grains specified by the Secretary by 20 percent of their 1959-60 acreage of corn and grain sorghums. S. 993 would require producers to make a 30 percent reduction in this acreage, including also other feed grains.

The increase in the required reduction of 30 percent by the Senate bill from that required by the House bill would result in reducing participation. Aside from other aspects, many producers who would be willing to reduce acreage by 20 percent may be considerably less willing to make a full 30-percent reduction.

Further, under the House bill, producers are extended the opportunity of making additional reductions over and above the 20 percent required to be eligible for price support. This would be accomplished by permitting producers to be paid in cash or kind, at the 50-percent rate on up to 20 acres if this is larger than 20 percent of their 1959-60 acreage. Producers also would have the opportunities, if they prefer, to retire

an additional 20 percent on which they would be paid in kind at the rate of 60 percent of their normal yield.

I believe these two provisions of the House bill would result in increased participation. The 20-acre provision will materially encourage participation by producers having small acreages of corn or grain sorghums, in that many would probably prefer to retire more than 2 or 3 acres. In some cases this would permit producers to retire an entire field or tract.

The increased participation that would come about is absolutely necessary if we are to reduce production below consumption, and thus make inroads in CCC stocks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD, a tabulation giving a comparison of the major provisions of the feed-grain program for 1961.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

*Comparison of major provisions of a feed grain program for 1961*

Item (1)	H.R. 4510 (Rept. No. 29) (2)	S. 993 (Rept. No. 59) (3)
1. Price support level: (a) Corn..... (b) Other feed grains: Oats, barley, rye, grain sorghum.....	(a) Not less than 65 percent of parity..... (b) Fair and reasonable in relation to level for corn in consideration of their feeding value and factors set forth in sec. 401(b).	(a) \$1.20 per bushel. (b) Same as H.R. 4510.
2. Price support eligibility: (a) Corn and grain sorghum..... (b) Other feed grains..... (c) Soybeans..... (d) Other oilseed crops.....	(a) Participation required in special agricultural conservation program. (b) Participation required in special agricultural conservation program to extent prescribed by Secretary. (c) Participation required in special agricultural conservation program. (d) Participation required in special agricultural conservation program to extent prescribed by Secretary.	(a) Same as H.R. 4510. (b) Participation required in special agricultural conservation program. (c) No requirement. (d) No requirement.
3. Reduction from 1959-60 average acreage provided for in SACP: (a) Mandatory reduction..... (b) Further optional reduction.....	(a) 20 percent of corn and grain sorghum acreage (or optionally, up to 20 acres). (b) An additional 20 percent of corn and grain sorghum acreage.	(a) 30 percent of corn, grain sorghum, oats, rye, and barley acreage. (b) No optional provision.
4. Payment rates provided on reduced acreage.....	50 percent of average yield (in cash or kind) on mandatory 20-percent reduction. 60 percent of average yield in kind on additional optional reduction. The report clarifies that it might be possible for CCC to act as the agent of farmers in selling certificates.	50 percent of average yield (in cash) on 1/2 of the mandatory 30-percent reduction. 60 percent of average yield (in kind) on the other half of mandatory reduction. The bill clarifies that in-kind negotiable certificates would be valued at the support price, but redeemed at the market price. CCC would provide assistance in marketing certificates. Makes no change in current law, therefore minimum would be that level which would not substantially impair any price support program.
5. Minimum CCC sale price for feed grains.....	Not less than 83 percent of support price.....	

Other provisions which are different in the 2 bills:

1. H.R. 4510:

(a) Acreage diverted from corn and grain sorghums could be used to produce any nonsurplus, non-price-supported, nonfeed crop, in lieu of diversion to a soil conserving crop, but no payment would be made.

(b) Price support of corn and grain sorghum would be limited to the normal production of the harvested acreage. Neither of these provisions are in S. 993.  
2. S. 993: Acreage devoted to nonconserving crops could not exceed the 1959-60 average, less the required reduction in feed grain acreage.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota, as we all know, is one of the experts in this field. I have had the pleasure of sitting by him and with him under the chairmanship of the great senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I wish to say on the floor of the Senate this afternoon that, as a businessman, I became convinced, after years on that great committee, there were two basic problems which must be faced up to and licked if we are going to solve this agriculture problem. The first is we must get rid of these excess inventories. Anybody who has been in business knows that excess inventories are always potential dynamite to the future of any business. Therefore, one of the two most important actions the Congress should

take is to make an effort to get rid of these inventories. The second is to see that, once we have gotten rid of the inventories, they never reappear in the future anywhere near to the degree and extent they have in the past.

My apprehension about this bill, which has been worked on by one of the most able public servants in this administration, Secretary Freeman, is that if we put this amendment into law we shall defeat both of these two major objectives. We shall not have legislation which will make it possible to get rid of the inventories; and, therefore, we shall not have legislation which will prevent those inventories from being built up further in the future.

It was for that reason I presented these thoughts to the Senate this afternoon.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, do I have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I yield the floor to my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Wyoming will be willing to bear with us a moment in order to call up a nomination that is at the desk.

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, what I have to say will take only a minute.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I should like to accommodate our colleague from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN].

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session and proceed to consider the nomination of Mrs. Gladys Avery Tillett to be U.S. representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

## UNITED NATIONS COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Mrs. Gladys Avery Tillett to be U.S. representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it is a rare privilege for me to have an opportunity to urge the confirmation of the nomination of a native of my town of Morganton, N.C.

When this appointment was made by President Kennedy, the Greensboro Daily News, of Greensboro, N.C., wrote:

If we were choosing a woman who exemplified North Carolina's best traits in ability and character, Mrs. Charles Tillett would fill that bill.

Mrs. Tillett is a person of rare intelligence, profound education, and unsurpassed political courage; and even above these things, she possesses that quality which we call an understanding heart. Her understanding heart enables her to comprehend and sympathize with the problems of other people, and to seek to find for those problems sound and sensible conclusions.

I do not believe the President could have found a more qualified person for the post of U.S. representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women than Mrs. Tillett.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, certain biographical data relating to Mrs. Tillett, and showing the great services she has rendered to her State and Nation in times past, an editorial from the Greensboro Daily News of Greensboro, N.C., from which I have quoted, and an editorial from my hometown paper, the Morganton (N.C.) News-Herald.

There being no objection, the statement and editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## WHO'S WHO OF AMERICAN WOMEN, FIRST EDITION, 1958

Mrs. Charles Walter Tillett (Gladys Avery), political worker, born Morganton, N.C. Daughter of A. C. and Sara Love Thomas Avery.

B.A., Woman's College, University of North Carolina, 1915. B.A., University of North Carolina, 1917, LL.D., 1948. Postgraduate, Columbia Summer School, 1925.

Married Charles W. Tillett, July 21, 1917.

Children: Gladys Avery (Mrs. William I. Coddington), Charles W., III, and Sara Avery (Mrs. William W. Thomas, Jr.).

Organizer, first president, Mecklenburg County, N.C., League of Women Voters (first county league of North Carolina), 1922-23. Member of State board, 1923-33. State president, 1933-34.

North Carolina delegate to the Democratic National Convention, 1932, 1936, and 1940. Vice chairman, Democratic National Committee, 1940-50. Chairman, Women's division, 1940-48. Chairman, director, National Women's Campaign, 1944. Chairman, Women's Speakers Bureau, Democratic National Committee, 1936-40.

Member of the North Carolina Executive Committee, 1928-48; 1954-56. State vice chairman, 1934-36. North Carolina member of the national platform committee, Democratic National Convention, 1940. State chairman, women, North Carolina senatorial campaign, 1950. Assistant to national chairman, Adlai Stevenson campaign, 1956. North Carolina cochairman of Stevenson volunteers, 1956. Member of advertising political committee, National Democratic Committee, 1955.

Member of U.S. delegation to UNESCO Conference, Paris, France, 1949.

Board member, YWCA, Charlotte, N.C., 1922-30, 1944-52. Member of national board, YWCA, 1934-46.

Vice chairman, State advertising commission, North Carolina Reemployment Service, 1932-36.

Member of the home mission committee (first woman), Mecklenburg Presbytery, 1952-56.

Aided in establishment day nurseries for Negro children in housing project areas, 1950-58. Member of interracial committee, YWCA, 1934-40. North Carolina State chairman of the USO, 1942-46. Trustee, consolidated University of North Carolina, 1952-. Member of the American Association of the United National (North Carolina cochairman, 1954-58); Pan Pacific and Southeastern Asia Women's Association of the U.S.A. (delegate to the conference in Tokyo, Japan, 1958); Asia Society; National Federation of Women's Clubs; American Association of University Women; Colonial Dames of America.

Clubs: City, Country of Charlotte.

Home: 2200 Sherwood Avenue, Charlotte, N.C.

[From Greensboro Daily News]  
AN EXCELLENT APPOINTMENT

President Kennedy's appointment of Mrs. Gladys Avery Tillett of Charlotte as U.S. representative to the United Nations' Commission on the Status of Women is an ideal use of Tarheel talent.

Mrs. Tillett has been working all her adult life for the cause of women in civic endeavor. Her career is a striking example of how energy, good sense and charm combined can do wonders for any worthy cause.

From the very start, when she organized the first North Carolina chapter of the League of Women Voters, Gladys Tillett has stood foursquare for those qualities of the mind and spirit which uplift and inspire. Always willing to work at the most menial or the most exalted task with cheerfulness and efficiency, she has achieved what her 1948 citation for an honorary degree from the University of North Carolina proclaimed she had achieved: "politics without demagoguery, excellence without arrogance and democracy without vulgarity."

If we were choosing a woman who exemplified North Carolina's best traits in ability and character, Mrs. Charles Tillett would fill that bill.

President Kennedy will later appoint Mrs. Tillett as an alternate delegate to the U.N. General Assembly. He could choose few able representatives of the finest in American life.

## [From the News-Herald, Feb. 28, 1961]

## PRIDE IN A NATIVE DAUGHTER

Morganton well has reason to be proud. One of her daughters, Mrs. Charles W. Tillett, the former Gladys Avery, has been selected by President Kennedy to be U.S.

representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

The appointment came as no surprise. The native of Morganton, who currently lives in Charlotte, has risen to national leadership in Democratic politics and has been an outstanding advocate of women's rights and religious freedom for more than three decades. She served on the national Democratic executive committee for 10 years, holds a degree in law, and played a strong part in organizing the support of women throughout the Nation for the formation of the United Nations. In 1944 she was named a keynoter at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago and the same year directed the party's women's campaign nationally.

Her job will pay \$19,800 a year and the President has indicated that he intends to make her an alternate delegate to the U.N. General Assembly when it convenes this fall.

Thus Mrs. Tillett, daughter of the late Judge and Mrs. A. C. Avery, joins a growing number of southerners and Tarheels appointed to positions in the new Democratic administration. We commend President Kennedy on his selection, which has for some time been rumored in the State.

He could have hardly made, it seems to us, a better choice. Mrs. Tillett, judging from her past performance—she long has been an advocate of women's rights and of religious freedom—could hardly be classified as a conservative. But then neither is North Carolina, at least in the South. Her job, however, will be to represent this country's women in a worldwide organization and to do that effectively it seems to us that it will take someone capable of understanding and expressing the viewpoint of the Nation as a whole. Mrs. Tillett's attitude might best be summed up in a statement made when she was presented an honorary degree at the University of North Carolina. She was described as one who would have politics "without demagoguery, excellence without arrogance, and democracy without vulgarity."

We wish her well on this new venture, undertaken at a time when she might have chosen to rest on past honors. We feel sure that she, with her education, experience, and background, will be more than a credit to her State. Although she is entering what might be described as the first practical attempt at world government and law—and this in crucial times—we feel sure that she will more than hold her own.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished Senator from Minnesota for offering me this opportunity to make these remarks.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I merely wish to add that it has been my pleasure to have known Mrs. Tillett for many years. While, of course, I have not known her as well or as long as has the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, I must say she is an outstanding woman and a fine, public-spirited citizen. The State of North Carolina can be very proud of her, as indeed her Senator has indicated here today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.



The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### AMERICAN COMPETITION IN FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I should like to call to the attention of Members of the Senate a rather extended article discussing the status of American foreign trade and American competition in foreign trade. A digest of the article was carried in the morning press, the Washington Post, under the byline Franck C. Porter.

The article itself, which appeared in the Harvard Business Review, was written by Raphael Hodgson and Michael Michaelis.

Because of our concern over the competitive capabilities of American business overseas, we have been continually inquiring into these opportunities and the conditions which appertain thereto.

It is the suggestion of this very careful study that perhaps private enterprise has not been competing but only delivering goods; that in the luxurious position in which we found ourselves immediately after the war, when we had most of the markets of the world under our control, we enjoyed the comfort of merely delivering to those who ordered what we had; and that we may now have reached the point—perhaps we have passed it—at which we have to go to work again, with the genius of American initiative, to compete openly for these markets.

It is interesting to note that these two scholars suggest the cost of American products in competition overseas has not increased as rapidly as the cost of similar products being manufactured overseas, and that if our own business people will go to work they will discover a more extensive market to be had in open competition than they have been willing to acknowledge.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the newspaper article printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INFERIORITY COMPLEX IN EXPORTS—U.S. FIRMS FORGET OWN STRENGTH, AUTHORS INSIST  
(By Franck C. Porter)

American businessmen faced with growing competition from overseas, could much better throw their weight toward the reduction of foreign tariffs than toward increasing protection at home.

This is one of the major conclusions of "Planning for Profits in World Business," a discussion of international trade by Raphael Hodgson and Michael Michaelis in the Harvard Business Review.

They take note of our growing balance of payments deficit, of increasing imports, of the growing technical and marketing proficiency of foreign producers, and of lower labor costs overseas. But at the same time, they strongly advise that American business has much to gain from even freer trade and much to lose from increased protectionism.

For one thing, Hodgson and Michaelis suggest, American business has fallen victim to an inferiority complex in overseas trade. "The international competitive strength of American industry has of late been severely misjudged," they write. "The topic regularly calls up some of the most emotional and

irrational thinking that goes on in management. Many executives have forgotten the competitive strength of their firms and have remained unaware of foreign profit opportunities. They forgot that their own companies are still the most formidably competitive in the world."

The authors also feel that American companies haven't made sufficient effort to increase overseas sales. "The export activities of many U.S. firms still consist merely of order taking from a loosely run network of worldwide distributors. Products are not even modified for foreign markets, and the needs of even the more important foreign markets are not reflected at all in product development and design. Promotional money is not spent; no real fight is made for the few distribution channels of any quality. Market understanding is zero and follow-up is spasmodic.

"The lack of commitment would mean extinction in the home market; yet those concerned with the deterioration of the U.S. export share have been excessively preoccupied with price. 'We're pricing ourselves out of world markets,' has been their slogan."

Hodgson and Michaelis offer figures in support of their contention that the "general cost level of American products has not increased faster than foreign costs," and they say this should dispel the cries that we're pricing ourselves out of business. While labor costs per unit were increasing 3 percent in the United States from 1953 through 1958, for example, they were going up 26 percent in the United Kingdom, and 7 percent in West Germany and France. (They declined 7 and 3 percent respectively in Italy and Japan, however.)

The article contends that although the type and number of imports into the United States will tend to increase in coming years, the rise in domestic volumes of these foreign products will be accompanied by a rise in foreign wages. And this in turn will tend to decrease foreign producers' ability to underprice American firms.

#### CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRAM

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and other Senators I introduce seven bills designed to help bring us closer to the goal of equal treatment and opportunity for all Americans regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred.

The bills, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1253. A bill providing relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation and facilities furnished or connected therewith; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1254. A bill to extend to uniformed members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1255. A bill to amend and supplement existing civil rights statutes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1256. A bill to declare certain rights of all persons within the jurisdiction of the United States, and for the protection of such persons from lynching, and for other purposes; and

S. 1257. A bill to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1258. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. GRUENING, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Hawaii, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. MORSE, Mrs. NEUBERGER, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, and Mr. KUCHEL):

S. 1259. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition for voting in any primary or other election for national officers; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I offer these measures in the belief that the single most glaring flaw in the moral fiber of our country today is the all-too-common pattern of discrimination displayed against certain minorities—Negroes in particular.

In saying this let me make it clear that this is not a problem peculiar to only certain sections of our country. None of us can be smug and self-righteous. While discriminatory practices in many Southern States have been backed up by local segregation laws, in other areas of our country Negroes have all too frequently found the doors of opportunity closed in their faces due to "gentlemen's agreements." Laws requiring segregated schools are to be deplored, but so are private real estate agreements which exist in practically all of our growing suburban areas to exclude Negroes.

No, Mr. President, this is not a time for name calling or for a holier-than-thou attitude. It is a time for men and women of good will—in all of our 50 States—to work toward a common goal of promoting human equality. And I am convinced that we will attain this cherished goal.

In urging prompt and determined action in this field, I am not unmindful of the very real progress we have been making in recent years. The election of a Catholic to the White House last year illustrates how far we have come since the days when Al Smith ran for the Presidency. And it was not too far back in history that the nomination of Louis

Brandeis, a Jew, to serve on the Supreme Court created a great stir. Today two distinguished members of the President's Cabinet are of the Jewish faith; their religion was not even a factor in considering the confirmation of their nominations by the Senate. Thanks to the unanimous decision of the Supreme Court in 1954 in the school cases, desegregation of public schools is taking place. There is still heavy resistance in certain areas to complying with the Supreme Court's decision, but it is quite clear that segregated schools are on the way out.

The walls of discrimination are crumbling. There is a growing awareness that discrimination simply does not make sense, and is contrary to our basic sense of justice and respect for basic human rights.

The Executive order issued by President Kennedy this past Monday establishing a Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity was a significant step in breaking down the employment barriers which Negroes face. I commend the President for taking this action to assure that there shall be no discrimination in Federal employment or by Government contractors. This Executive order contains more than nice sounding words—it gives the Committee enforcement powers to stamp out discriminatory hiring practices.

The President's action, I may say, comes as no surprise to me. It is typical of the bold and decisive leadership which President Kennedy is providing. It is in keeping with his campaign promise to use the powers of the Presidency to see to it that the Government is not a party to discriminatory practices. This Executive order is an example of the type of action on civil rights which can be taken by the executive branch. I am confident that the President will continue to use his authority and influence to protect the rights of every American.

This is a time, Mr. President, for determined, constant efforts by every branch of Government and by every community in America to move the Nation ahead in the field of human rights.

The President, the courts, private organizations, and groups of citizens are working ceaselessly to stamp out discrimination which blocks the progress of millions of citizens and blotches our reputation throughout the world.

Congress should keep pace with this effort to secure and to protect the rights of every American. We cannot be satisfied with legislative action every third year. We need action and progress this year and every year.

And so it is with a sense of urgency that I offer these bills today. Our fellow citizens who, due to their color, have been treated as second-class Americans are demanding their equal rights. Let us in the Congress join in this cause for racial justice.

A brief explanation of each of the measures which I send to the desk is as follows:

First. A bill to provide relief against certain forms of discrimination in interstate transportation, designed to im-

plement Supreme Court rulings that segregation in interstate transportation is a denial of constitutional rights.

Second. A bill to extend to members of the Armed Forces the same protection against bodily attack as is now granted to personnel of the Coast Guard. That is really a technical bill.

Third. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment.

Fourth. A bill outlawing the poll tax as a condition of voting in any primary or other election for national officers.

Mr. President, I joined with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and other Senators in offering a constitutional amendment to attain this particular objective.

Fifth. A bill to strengthen certain criminal civil rights statutes and providing additional civil remedies to persons deprived of their civil rights.

Sixth. A bill to make lynching a Federal offense.

Seventh. A bill to indefinitely extend the Civil Rights Commission which is due to expire on November 8, 1961.

Mr. President, I believe the Civil Rights Commission has done good work and has acted as an objective observer and analyst of the progress of civil rights and, indeed, of the violations of civil rights in the Nation. It would be well for the Congress to establish a special joint committee on civil rights, so that the reports of the Civil Rights Commission may be studied in depth and in detail by a special committee in the Congress which could emphasize these matters.

I must say, Mr. President, if we can have a committee in the Congress on un-American activities, we surely ought to be able to have a committee in the Congress on the protection of civil rights.

The Committee on Un-American Activities, I hasten to add, could look into the areas of discrimination on civil rights and find some very un-American activities. It might be a very fertile field for investigation for whatever committee might wish to investigate. In the Senate, of course, we have the Subcommittee on Constitutional Rights which has done a very good job.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that editorials from today's Washington Post and Times Herald and New York Times commenting favorably on the President's executive order setting up the new Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1961]

#### OPPORTUNITY BY ORDER

True to his campaign promise to move by Executive order against racial discrimination in public business, President Kennedy has combined two existing committees into a new Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity. The order is far reaching. With Vice President JOHNSON as chairman and Secretary of Labor Goldberg as vice chairman, the committee will be empowered to obtain affirmative pledges from contractors to employ applicants without discrimination, to require compliance reports, to hold

hearings and to publish the names of contractor or union violators, and to terminate existing contracts and forbid new contracts in the event of uncorrected discriminatory practices.

Whether the new committee will be more effective than its predecessors, which in the Eisenhower administration did a useful if somewhat timid job of breaking the ice in some areas, will depend in part upon the amount of determination supplied. The powers available to the new group are augmented in some respects but are basically similar to those previously authorized but infrequently invoked. The problems, particularly those with recalcitrant labor unions, remain very much the same (and here the services of Mr. Goldberg ought to be especially important).

Fortunately, there are many evidences that despite occasional anomalies such as the Meriwether nomination the Kennedy administration is indeed determined to advance equality of opportunity and civil rights generally through a combination of Executive leadership, conciliation, court action, and possible legislation. There are many challenges here in Washington as well as around the country. It is a significant fact that there are relatively few Negroes in the higher echelons of Government. Qualification and ability always ought to be the criteria, but the pattern suggests that other considerations may have been applied.

It is not to be supposed that even a vigorous and sustained effort can easily succeed in banishing racial discrimination in the areas covered by Government contracts, much less in the far larger area of non-governmental private business. Nevertheless, example is persuasive; moreover, the climate is changing rapidly, thanks in part to the wise adjustments that have been made in consequence of the sit-in movement. If the administration now will complement its legal action to insure respect for voting rights with a showing that it means business in its own hiring practices and in Government contracts, the day when equality of opportunity becomes a reality may be notably advanced.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 8, 1961]

#### "MOVING AHEAD" AGAINST BIAS

We applaud President Kennedy's forthright attack on discrimination in Federal employment through his Executive order setting up the new Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

For some years it has been the official policy of the Government not to discriminate against its own employees because of race, creed, color, or national origin. And the same policy has been required of companies in Government contract operations. But enforcement by the two previous committees in this field was much too sketchy—especially in the case of private contractors—largely through the lack of clearly defined powers and also personnel.

President Kennedy's order meets both these shortcomings with an imaginative and hard-hitting program—hard hitting in its possibilities, but tempered by education and persuasion. The antidiscrimination clauses in Government contracts and subcontracts will be wider and sharper than before. They will also be at least partly self-enforcing through the regular required reports to the committee as to compliance by the contractors and also subcontractors. And now the committee, by itself or through the Labor Department as its investigational arm, will be able to check these and probe for violations. That Labor Secretary Goldberg is Executive Vice Chairman of the Committee promises forceful action in this and other areas.

While the new Committee has no direct control over the affairs of labor unions, it



may be able to help reduce what discrimination in them still exists, in spite of the firm policy against it of the AFL-CIO and its affiliates. The requirement of statements from unions involved in Government contracts that their membership policies are free from bias, with publicity in case of refusal, might at least bring the power of exposure to bear against discrimination.

We have no illusions that the new Committee can wipe out discrimination in Federal employment with more than deliberate speed, but it can do far more than has been done before, and faster. The Committee deserves unqualified public support, and also more permanence than has now been given it by an Executive order.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I understand one of the cosponsors of these bills, the distinguished Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG], wishes to join in this discussion, and I now yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. LONG of Hawaii. Mr. President, I wish to add my thoughts to those so ably expressed by my friend, the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota. To me, the program envisioned by the bills here introduced is more than the sum of its parts. Each bill is designed—and, I believe well designed—to correct or ameliorate some specific evil or injustice that is now prevalent, or is possible under our laws.

The sponsors of these bills, among whom I am proud to be numbered, seek to deter discrimination in transportation, employment, and voting; to strengthen the guarantees of personal safety afforded to members of our Armed Forces and those in custody; and to implement further the existing constitutional safeguards by extending the life of the present Civil Rights Commission. These are all worthy ends in themselves and well worth the consideration of this body.

But I feel that this program would do more. Its enactment would be a milestone in the slow progress of humanity toward humanitarianism—a way station on the long road toward the realization of the American dream.

For in reality this program goes far beyond deterring injustices. This is a program that will put the full legal and moral authority of the United States of America behind the concept of human dignity. Given this authoritative support, is it not reasonable to forecast that our communities and citizens will be more ready to uphold and vigorously to support this noble concept to which the great majority already subscribe?

My own State of Hawaii has long been noted for its interracial harmony. But this harmony is not merely the absence of specified discriminations or injustices. It is the acceptance of humanity in the large as being human—the adoption of the idea that no man is less nor more because of his race or religion. There is only one basis on which any human being can be judged, and that is personal worth.

In my view, Mr. President, recognition of human dignity in all persons is one of the loftiest goals to which we can aspire. Our laws, our institutions, our faith, and our own humanity cry out that dignity is that which makes

a man. For without this essential ingredient, a man is less than a man. And who can face the consequences of reducing God's own creation to something less than the Creator intended?

The legislation introduced today would make dignity and full humanity for all, the stated, official, and legal goal of the United States. We dare not do less.

#### FEED GRAINS PROGRAM FOR 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 993) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to address myself to the pending measure.

Within a few hours after the message came from the President and the Secretary of Agriculture, S. 993 was introduced in the Senate. Soon thereafter the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry met with the view of speeding up consideration of the bill. I am glad to say that the committee met and held hearings, and within hours the bill that is now before the Senate was reported for action.

The reason why we proceeded at such a rapid pace was the necessity for early passage of the bill. As all of us know, planting of corn and other feed grains has begun in quite a few areas of our country already. If the program is to be effective, in order to accomplish what the President and the Secretary of Agriculture desire, we must act upon the necessary legislation quickly.

I hope that the House will complete its deliberations on the bill today. I was informed a few moments ago that the House has started to consider amendments, and the probabilities are that final action on the bill will not take effect until probably 5, 5:30, or perhaps 6 o'clock tonight. Some Senators are desirous of deferring action until tomorrow, and have suggested that we merely consider the bill, make opening statements, and present reasons for the passage of the bill. Then it can go over until tomorrow, when in all probability the House will have acted on its bill. After a brief debate tomorrow, I hope we shall be able to call up the House bill when enacted and substitute the language of the Senate bill for the House bill, so that the measure can go to conference as soon as possible.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I think it should be understood that the remainder of the afternoon can be held open for discussion, as the chairman of the committee has indicated. But for the benefit of Senators who were concerned about whether there will be a vote tonight. I should like to say that the vote will take place tomorrow, in light of the report we have received as to the action in the other body. The Senator has indicated that this would be the procedure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Earlier today I was informed that the House may complete its deliberations and send the bill over to us by 4 o'clock.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, in light of that report, it was my view that we

should consider our bill and act upon it today. But since it is apparent from the most recent reports given to me that the House will be a little late in completing its deliberations, it might be best for consideration of the bill to go over until tomorrow as soon as the presentation of the bill is made, and such other speeches as Senators desire to make are made. My hope is that Senators who desire to speak will do so, and that those who desire to ask questions will do so, so that we shall not be engaged in a long debate tomorrow. I should like to have quick action on the bill so that it can go into conference. I hope the Senate and House conferees will be able to get together and send a bill to the President not later than Friday, but, in any event as quickly as possible.

We have before us today a very simple bill.

It is a 1-year emergency program for corn and the other feed grains.

The purpose of the bill is to:

First. Raise farm income.

Second. Reduce stocks of feed grains.

Third. Reduce the cost to the Government.

It is imperative that immediate action be taken in the case of these commodities.

The President of the United States said in his message to the Congress that, and I quote:

I urgently recommend to the Congress the enactment of this emergency program so that it can cover the 1961 crop.

The existing program has failed. It has resulted in the accumulation of a burdensome and dangerous surplus, mainly of commodities for which there is no adequate outlet even under our expanded programs of providing food for those in need.

By this fall, the Nation will be confronted once again with a shortage of space in which to store grain. The shortage may amount to the off-farm space required for as much as 200 to 250 million bushels if we fail to take any preventive action now.

I may say in passing that I believe the President was estimating on the low side. It strikes me that if corn production, and in fact all grains follow the pattern of last year, we may need much more storage than what the President indicates.

Mr. President, as of January 31, 1961, the Government had \$4,246 million invested in 2,973 million bushels of feed grains.

Of course that includes corn, sorghum, and other feed grains, such as barley and oats.

The present open-end feed grain program designed by Mr. Benson to permit farmers unlimited production and still provide price supports has been the principal reason for the high CCC stocks. From 1955 to 1960 CCC stocks of feed grains increased by 169 percent, and investment increased by 156 percent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a table showing CCC investment in feed grains.

I invite Senators to study the table. It is indicative of the conditions in which the feed grain producers find themselves.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

TABLE 1.—CCC investment in feed grains, Jan. 31, 1955-60, compared

Commodity	Quantity	Percent change	Value	Percent change	Support price
	<i>Million bushels</i>		<i>Million dollars</i>		
Corn:					
1955	810		1,328		1.58
1960	2,056	+154	3,069	+131	1.06
Sorghum grain:					
1955	112		153		1.78
1960	754	+573	1,036	+577	1.52
Oats:					
1955	83		66		.60
1960	46	-44	26	-61	.50
Barley:					
1955	99		114		.92
1960	117	+18	115	+1	.77
All grains:					
1955	1,104		1,661		
1960	2,973	+169	4,246	+156	

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the costs for storage, handling, and transportation of Government-owned feed grain in fiscal 1960 amounted to \$289 million. This accounted for 48 percent of the total storage, handling, and transportation of all Government-owned commodities.

Of course, the feed grain program is aggravated by the substantial increases in yield per acre that have occurred in recent years.

For example, the yield per acre for corn has increased 30.5 percent since 1955, while that for sorghum grains has increased by 118.5 percent.

These tremendous increases in yield per acre, coupled with slight acreage in-

creases for the above two crops, have caused the total supply of feed grains to reach an all-time high.

The total supply of corn as of October 1, 1960, amounted to an unprecedented 6,143 million bushels. This was an increase of 43.9 percent over 1955.

The total supply of grain sorghum increased 283.6 percent from 1955.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a table showing individual feed grains acreage, yield, and so forth. This table shows the vast increases that I have just pointed out in the production of corn and other feed grains.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 2.—Individual feed grains: Percent change in acreage, yield per acre, production, carryover, and total supply, 1955-60

	Acreage harvested	Percent change	Yield per acre	Percent change	Production	Percent change	Carryover	Percent change	Total supply	Percent change
	<i>Million acres</i>		<i>Bushels</i>		<i>Million bushels</i>		<i>Million bushels</i>		<i>Million bushels</i>	
Corn:										
1955	79.5		40.6		3,320		1,035		4,296	
1960	82.1	+3.2	53.0	+30.5	4,353	+34.7	1,789	+72.8	6,143	+43.9
Sorghum:										
1955	12.9		18.9		243		75		318	
1960	15.4	+19.3	41.3	+118.5	638	+162.5	582	+676.0	1,220	+283.6
Oats:										
1955	39.2		38.3		1,503		303		1,809	
1960	27.1	-30.8	42.9	+12.0	1,162	-22.6	268	-11.5	1,435	-20.6
Barley:										
1955	14.6		27.5		401		131		560	
1960	14.0	-4.1	30.3	+10.1	423	+5.4	168	+28.2	606	+8.2

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, record supplies of feed grains are available. Production of all feed grains combined increased 28.7 percent since 1955 due to an increase in yield per acre of 35.5 percent.

The increase in total production of all feed grains resulted notwithstanding a decrease in the total acreage of 5.1 percent caused by the decrease in the acreage devoted to oats.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a table showing all feed grains combined.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—All feed grains: Percent change in acreage, yield per acre, and production, 1955-60

	Acreage harvested	Percent change	Yield per acre	Percent change	Production	Percent change
	<i>Million acres</i>		<i>Tons</i>		<i>Million tons</i>	
1955	146.2		0.90		130.9	
1960	138.6	-5.1	1.22	+35.5	168.5	+28.7

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, in my humble judgment the production possibilities in feed grains demand emergency action.

While it is true that the total use of feed grains is increasing substantially, the fact remains that feed grain production has far outstripped the use of these grains.

For example, total disappearance of corn increased by 33.6 percent from 1955 to 1960, but—and this is most important—the increase in the total supply of

corn amounted to 43.9 percent. Use of sorghum grain also increased substantially. As a matter of fact, it outstripped corn with an increase of 120.3 percent. But at the same time the total supply of sorghum increased 286.0 percent.

All together use of the four major feed grains increased by only 25 percent while the total supply increased by 42.6 percent, almost twice as much.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a table showing feed grains supply and disappearance.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 4.—Feed grains: Comparison of total supply and disappearance, 1955-60

	Total supply	Percent change	Total disappearance	Percent change
	<i>Million bushels</i>		<i>Million bushels</i>	
Corn:				
1955	4,296		3,100	
1960	6,143	+43.9	4,143	+33.6
Sorghum grain:				
1955	318		236	
1960	1,220	+286.0	520	+120.3
Oats:				
1955	1,809		1,462	
1960	1,435	-20.6	1,135	-22.3
Barley:				
1955	560		443	
1960	606	+8.2	441	-4
All grains:				
1955	171		128	
1960	244	+42.6	160	+25.0

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as I said before, this is a simple bill. It is designed to reduce production. It is designed to increase farm income. It is designed to reduce the cost to the Government.

Mr. President, I may add that the bill is self-sufficient in that it contains all the necessary procedures which the Secretary of Agriculture must follow in order to administer it. We do not even refer to existing laws. Wherever necessary, we have included in the pending bill a repetition of existing laws, particularly in reference to the support price to be paid for sorghum, barley, rye, and oats.

As all of us know, there is written into law a certain formula whereby the Secretary of Agriculture fixes the support price for sorghum and other feed grains in relation to corn. I believe that is the only repetition of existing law of any consequence that we have made in the bill. The bill itself prescribes all the methods by which the Secretary of Agriculture is to proceed in administering the law, if enacted.

The bill is an emergency measure applicable only to 1961 crops. As amended by the committee amendment, it would do three things:

First, it would increase feed grain price support levels;

Second, it would require the retirement of feed grain acreage as a condition or price support; and

Third, it would provide payments to farmers for such acreage retirement.

Under existing law the support level for corn is fixed at 90 percent of the average price received by farmers during the preceding 3 calendar years, but not less than 65 percent of parity. For the 1960 crop under this formula the support price is \$1.06 a bushel. For 1961 the Secretary of Agriculture has estimated that this formula would result in a support price of \$1.05. Under the bill



the support price for corn would be increased to \$1.20 a bushel.

Support prices for oats, rye, barley, and grain sorghums are fixed under existing law at fair and reasonable levels in relation to corn, and would continue to be fixed in the same manner under this bill. Thus, by raising the support level for corn, the bill would provide similar increases for the other feed grains. According to estimates furnished by the Secretary of Agriculture, the support price for grain sorghums of \$1.52 a hundredweight for 1960 would be increased to about \$1.88 for 1961. Oats would be raised from 50 cents a bushel for 1960 to about 62 cents for 1961; and barley would go from 77 cents a bushel to about 93 cents.

As a condition of eligibility for price support on any of the feed grains: corn, oats, rye, barley, or grain sorghums, the committee amendment would require producers to divert 30 percent of their 1959-60 average acreage of corn and grain sorghums to soil-conserving uses. Similar 30 percent diversions of oats, rye, or barley acreage could be required by the Secretary at his discretion.

The reason for this provision is that there is much of those three feed grains already planted, and the committee felt it could not deal specifically with those three commodities, as was the case with corn and sorghum, which are yet to be planted. The main planting will start in the South shortly. However, I believe it is safe to say that if the bill shall be enacted by Monday or Tuesday of next week, the Secretary of Agriculture will have ample time to deal with the situation, particularly in respect to corn and sorghum.

To accomplish the required diversion from corn and grain sorghums, producers would have to reduce their corn and grain sorghums acreage 30 percent, reduce their total acreage of nonconserving crops by the same number of acres, and devote that number of acres to conserving uses, neither harvesting nor grazing it. It was the intention of the committee that the land retired from feed grain production would actually be taken out of production. The producer would not be permitted to divert it to other nonconserving crops, nor could he bring new land into the production of such crops.

For retiring feed grain acreage, as provided by the committee amendment, producers would receive payments in cash and in kind. Cash payment would be made for one-half of the acreage retired at a rate equal to 50 percent of the support price multiplied by the average 1959-60 yield of the commodity for the farm. Payment in kind would be made for the other half of the acreage retired at a rate equal to 60 percent of the support price multiplied by the same yield factor. Negotiable certificates would be issued for the value so determined and would be redeemable from Commodity Credit Corporation feed grain stocks valued at market prices at the time and place of redemption. Holders of payment-in-kind certificates would have to offer them for redemption within 60 days after their issuance, or bear

the additional carrying charges accruing after that period.

The method employed or suggested by the committee is very simple. A value is placed on the certificate, the value being determined by the support price multiplied by average yield, as I have just indicated. The holder of the certificate can either sell the certificate or go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and buy, for the value of the certificate, any of the feed grains which Commodity Credit Corporation has in its possession. Although the value of the certificate is based on the basic county support rate, still the holder of the certificate can go to CCC and buy that amount of sorghum grain or any other grain. He can buy No. 3 corn, if he wishes, or he can buy No. 1 corn, all at market price. He can use, if he desires, the facilities of the Commodity Credit Corporation to dispose of the certificate, if he does not desire to take payment in kind. Such disposition, of course, would be made at prevailing market prices.

Now I shall make a comparison of the committee amendment with the bill as introduced.

The committee amendment is designed to carry out the President's proposal, but is more detailed than the bill as introduced. The bill, as introduced, provided the Secretary of Agriculture with general authority for a feed grain acreage retirement program. In other words, the Secretary was left with much discretionary power. The Secretary stated that his intention was to require a 20-percent diversion of feed grain acreage as a condition of price support and to provide for the voluntary diversion of up to an additional 20 percent. The committee amendment requires a 30-percent diversion as a condition of price support, and makes no provision for further diversion.

The bill, as introduced, provided for payments at rates fixed by the Secretary, who stated that it was his intention to make cash payments at 60 percent of the support price for the first 20-percent diversion, and payments in kind at 66 2/3 percent of normal yield for the additional diversion. The committee amendment provides payments in cash at a 50-percent rate for half the required reduction and payments-in-kind at a 60-percent rate for the other half.

The bill, as introduced, contained two provisions permitting the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell feed grains at less than the support level. The first one related to payments in kind. Under the bill, as introduced, payments in kind would have been made through the issuance of certificates redeemable in cash or in kind, and the Commodity Credit Corporation would have been required to sell a sufficient quantity of feed grains at the market price to cover the cost of cash redemptions. The other resale provision was contained in section 3 of the bill. Section 3 of the bill, as introduced, authorized the Corporation to sell any feed grain at market price during the 1961-62 marketing year. The Secretary, when he appeared before the committee, suggested an amendment to

section 3 which would have prevented the Corporation from selling feed grains under section 3 at less than about \$1.05 for corn, and comparable levels for the other feed grains. Sale at market price to cover cash redemptions of payment-in-kind certificates would, however, still have been required.

Neither of these resale provisions is contained in the committee amendment. Under the committee amendment, payment-in-kind certificates can be redeemed only in kind. Early redemption would be encouraged, since, after 60 days, deductions for carrying charges would be made. The value of such certificates would be known, and their effect on the market could be evaluated. The Commodity Credit Corporation minimum resale price would be fixed under existing law, section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, at 105 percent of the current support price, plus reasonable carrying charges. The trade would, therefore, be encouraged to carry normal inventories, without danger of Commodity Credit Corporation sales at below support levels driving down market prices.

Mr. President, as I stated earlier, it is my hope that we shall debate this bill as long as necessary today, so that if and when the House passes its own version of the so-called feed grain bill, the Senate will then be ready, upon receipt of the House bill, to substitute the language contained in the Senate bill for the provisions of the House bill. I express the hope that that will be done not later than tomorrow. I express the further hope that the Senate will then have a conference with the House, and that the bill will be on the President's desk some time this week, and not later than Friday. However, I state frankly that I am a little dubious about that, because we shall not be able to act today on the House bill.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HART in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BURDICK. I compliment the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his very fine presentation this afternoon.

I support the proposed legislation. I believe we must make an approach to the problem of the surplus which exists in this area.

One feature of the measure approved by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry causes me some concern. What provision of the version approved by the committee would either induce or attract compliance?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course the increased price, and in addition, payment by the Government for the acres not planted to corn or other feed grains.

In that connection I wish to say that I am very hopeful that the producers of corn and other feed grains will comply with the measure which we seek to pass. To me, that will be an indication of whether the corn and other feed grain producers desire to have enacted any bill at all on this subject.

Mr. President, as I have often stated before the committee and, I believe, on the floor of the Senate, the corn producers have more or less been in a preferred class. Very few of the growers have shown any interest in a program similar to that for cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and wheat. As a result, the corn producers had almost *carte blanche* to increase acreage and produce more feed, without any penalties. I well remember that in 1956, when the soil bank program was being discussed, Mr. Benson said he thought it would do the job of reducing the corn production. So we passed the soil bank bill, and the corn acreage was reduced by approximately 5 million acres. But when the crop was gathered, instead of reduced corn production, there was an increase of 200 million bushels.

The Government spent almost \$180 million to carry on that program for corn alone, but there was increased production.

I express the hope, Mr. President, that the corn producers will come into the program. If they do not, let us end it, because they should be willing to comply with a program by means of which there can be effective control of the acreage and a consequent reduction in production, so the production will be in keeping with what we need. This will be an indication to me, as chairman of the committee, as to whether the corn producers do want a program. I hope there is at least 70 to 80 percent compliance. If there is that much compliance with the program provided by this bill, it will curtail production this year, as compared to that of last year, between 500 to 750 million bushels of feed grains.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield further?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BURDICK. Is it not a fact that the market price is somewhat influenced by the support prices?

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh, yes—necessarily.

Mr. BURDICK. Since this program is voluntary for the farmer, he will analyze it, and will decide what is best for himself. Suppose he decides not to go into the program, but increase his acres, believing the market price will be attractive to him.

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course there is that chance. But I express the hope that the producers of corn will not take that position, because, in that event—depending on what happens to corn and other feed grains this year—our entire program will be in jeopardy. In other words, as I have stated, we have an immense carryover of corn. The corn producers should recognize that, and should be willing to put their houses in order by following the provisions of the bill which we hope to enact, and it strikes me that they should follow through with it, after we have made the program so attractive for them. We propose to increase the price to \$1.20 a bushel, and if they take a cut of 30 percent in their acres, they will be paid for half the reduction in cash and for the other half in kind, to the extent I have indicated.

I think the proposal we are making to the feed grain producers is a very attractive one, and I hope they accept it and comply with it, so as to assist this administration to reduce the carryover of feed grain.

But if this bill does not pass, or if there is no compliance—as some may anticipate—we shall have to build more and more storage facilities, and that will require that additional sums be spent by the Government. The corn growers and the other feed grain growers should realize this, and should come to the assistance of their Government, in order to prevent further accumulation of the large supplies of corn and other feed grains.

Mr. BURDICK. I certainly hope there will be compliance. That is my only misgiving.

But I shall be happy to support the bill; and again I compliment the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. President, as I have stated, it is my judgment that we have made the program attractive enough, and that the producers should comply.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. Mr. President, I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with whom it had been my pleasure to work a number of years before I elected to leave the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, that I commend him for the approach and the sincerity of the methods in which he is trying to work this problem out with the other members of the committee.

As the Senator knows, I represent a State that is seriously interested in what happens to the wheat program and the sorghum grains program, not so much the corn program.

To many persons in my area, it was felt that the program placed considerable emphasis on the corn-producing areas, to the detriment of the sorghum grains producing areas. I notice in this bill there is no relationship established between feed grain, or the value of sorghum grains, and corn.

Am I to understand, from what the distinguished chairman has said, that the Secretary of Agriculture will make that determination, and that he is permitted to do that on the basis of the analysis which the Department of Agriculture has heretofore pointed out on a number of occasions?

Mr. ELLENDER. The formula that is now in the law with respect to support levels for the feed grains other than corn is repeated in the present proposal.

In my opening statement I indicated the approximate amounts of price supports that would be made available for sorghums, as well as oats and barley, based on a price of \$1.20 a bushel for corn.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. I was out of the Chamber for just a few moments and missed the Senator's discussion on that point.

I think the bill under discussion is a great improvement over the bill which

has come to us, and which I consider to be the administration's measure. I think it is a far better and a fairer bill.

I think the section in the bill which permitted the Secretary to sell on the open market below the support price, or \$1.05, would have done violence in a great many sections of the Nation, especially in those areas where the grain merchants had stocks of grain for sale on the open market. I think the proposal now before the Senate has strengthened the measure materially.

Finally, I wish to say to the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee that, while this is a 1-year period, and it is a trial period, I know something has to be done to eliminate the piling up of tremendous amounts of sorghum grains. In my State of Kansas and in other Midwestern areas the storage has pyramided greatly. I do not condemn the farmers who are doing it, because they have to get a return from their acreages based on the investments they have, and it is only natural for them to do so. I think we can try this approach for 1 year.

I do not know what will finally come before us as a wheat program, but we will cross that bridge when we come to it. I believe this measure will give us a trial period. I share the views of the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture and Forestry Committee when he says he hopes there will be compliance without positive police methods being used. Then we shall know what the sentiments and desires are. There is too short a period of time to have a referendum or some of the other methods we normally use.

Unless the bill is drastically changed by amendments, I intend to support it.

Mr. ELLENDER. In reply to the Senator from Kansas, on the question of the price of sorghums, according to the estimate furnished us by the Secretary of Agriculture, the price of sorghums per hundredweight in 1960 was \$1.52, and under the bill it would be increased to \$1.88. Barley and oats would be increased, also.

I am sure the bill as reported from the committee does not meet, on all fours, the views of all the members of the committee; but I honestly and sincerely believe it is the best we could obtain in the short time we had to consider it.

What I would have liked would have been a long-range bill affecting corn and other feed grains and wheat.

The Senator well remembers we passed in the Senate a couple of bills affecting wheat, but, unfortunately, on one occasion the House could not see eye to eye with us, and on the other occasion the President vetoed the bill.

I think it is incumbent upon us to enact legislation affecting wheat and corn on a long-term basis, because, if we do not, and if we continue with these vast accumulations, the whole farm program may be in jeopardy.

Mr. SCHOEPEL. If the Senator will yield further, I may say, finally, that I am looking forward to a long-range program that encompasses wheat in relation to sorghum grains and feed grains, because I recognize we are looking at this proposal as an emergency



proposition and that time is running out for the seeding of crops this year.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me add that I was told bills relating to wheat, corn, and other feed grains on a long-range basis are now being prepared and will be sent to us. As chairman of the Agriculture Committee, I entertain the hope of starting hearings on those bills as soon as we receive them, because, I repeat, I think it is urgent for us to enact legislation relating to those commodities.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. I thank the distinguished chairman.

#### NOMINATION OF LEE LOEVINGER TO BE AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

As in executive session,

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] wants to be heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I wish to ask the indulgence of my colleagues for a moment. There is a nomination at the desk that I am going to ask the Senate to consider as in executive session. I ask the clerk to state the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lee Loevinger to be an Assistant Attorney General.

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I have known Mr. Loevinger for 20 or more years, and I knew his family, his father and mother, before him.

Mr. Loevinger's father was one of our most distinguished jurists.

Mr. Lee Loevinger is a former member of the Minnesota Supreme Court, an outstanding lawyer, a graduate of the University of Minnesota Law School, with honors, and one of the outstanding scholars in the field of antitrust law.

I believe that this is a most fortunate nomination and appointment. Mr. Loevinger will strengthen the Department of Justice, particularly in that vital area of protecting the free enterprise economy by a sincere and conscientious policy of enforcement of the antitrust laws.

I am happy that his name is before us, and I am sure his nomination will be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. HUMPHREY. I ask that the President be notified immediately.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

#### FEED GRAINS PROGRAM FOR 1961

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 993) to provide a special program for feed grains for 1961.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 993 and ask to have it printed. This is an amendment to absorb part of the shock of the extra cost to the milk producers

of this country in the event that the bill which is now under consideration should pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie at the desk.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, I rise in support of the pending feed grain bill. It is only a temporary measure, of 1 year duration. It is far from perfect, but I believe it is a step in the right direction.

The failure to pass proposed wheat legislation in the past 4 or 5 years has resulted in an unnecessary piling up of wheat surpluses. By only a little compromise we could have enacted wheat legislation which would have retired at least 20 percent of the wheat acreage for each of the past 3 years. As a result of our failure to act, the wheat carryover has increased from 1,033 million bushels in 1956 to an estimated 1,485 million bushels by July 1 next.

During this same period of time there has been an even sharper increase in the carryover of feed grains. The carryover of corn has increased from 1,166 million bushels in 1956 to an estimated 2 billion bushels by July 1 next. Grain sorghums have increased from an 81 million bushel carryover in 1956 to an estimated 700 million bushel carryover by July 1 next.

The Commodity Credit Corporation now holds 2.7 billion bushels of feed grains, most of this being corn and grain sorghums. The total carryover of feed grains by July 1 next, is estimated at over 3 billion bushels.

If we do nothing at all it will mean that the Federal Government probably will have to find storage for some 200 or 300 million more bushels of feed grains this fall, and perhaps will have to acquire as much as 400 to 600 million additional bushels of supplies of feed grains.

Mr. President, most cattlemen and hogmen will agree that a great abundance of clean feed grains, sooner or later, will break meat prices. There is an old axiom which most farmers believe; that cheap feed prices mean cheap meat prices. Few will quarrel with that conclusion.

Mr. President, the main provisions of the bill have been described very ably by the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate. The bill would require that a farmer would have to reduce his acreage of feed grains by as much as 30 percent if he wished to be eligible for the higher price support. He could keep on producing, as he is free to do now, all he wishes to produce, and market it free of penalty if he did not desire the price supports.

The price support for corn would be increased from \$1.06 to \$1.20 a bushel. There would be a comparable increase in the price supports for other feed grains, for oats, and barley, and sorghums.

There would be a fair payment in kind to the farmer for taking his land out of production.

Mr. President, the major provisions of the bill are in line with Republican policy. I wish to read a few sentences

from the platform adopted by the National Republican Convention last year.

Acceleration of production adjustments, including a large-scale, land conservation reserve program on a voluntary and equitable rental basis.

Payment in kind, out of existing surpluses, as part of our land retirement program.

Mr. President, these and other provisions are pretty much in line with what the Republicans advocated during the last campaign. I think on the whole the bill represents a pretty good compromise between conflicting viewpoints of the various farm organizations and the two major political parties.

Mr. President, I may offer some minor amendments later. I hope they will be accepted, but if they are not I shall still support the bill because I believe it is a step in the right direction. We must do something to curtail the tremendous buildup of the feed-grain surpluses, as well as surpluses of other grains.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have the greatest of regard and admiration for the chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. He worked very diligently on the bill, as he does on all bills.

It was very important that we have rapid action from the committee in respect to this bill. I do not know how the committee could have acted faster. We are all set to act, before the House bill has come over. The bill has been delayed. I understand the Senate is set to act as soon as the House bill comes to the Senate. By tomorrow we shall be in a position to vote on the bill.

I think the Senator from Louisiana deserves credit for having moved the bill along as fast as he has. However, I have the same kind of hesitation about this bill, or at least parts of the bill, as the distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] expressed a little earlier.

The fact is, as very well set forth in a report from the Department of Agriculture which the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] put into the Record, that under the provisions of H.R. 4510, the House bill, the Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to sell corn and grain sorghums at any price no lower than 83 percent of the current support price, during the 1961 marketing year for these grains. S. 993 would provide CCC with no such authority, since this measure is silent on sales provisions; consequently, CCC would be required to rely upon the authority now in the law. Present authority would limit CCC sales to prices which would not substantially impair any price support program.

The sales provisions in the House bill are vital in my judgment to the success of the emergency feed grain program. It must be remembered that this program is being developed in a climate of urgency, in an effort to obtain a better balance in feed grain supplies through actions which could affect 1961 crop production. The program is strictly emergency in nature, and would apply

only to production from 1961 crops. Because planting time is rapidly approaching for corn and grain sorghums, there clearly is not time to develop a mandatory program which could be submitted to producers for referendum vote.

Because there is need for immediate action, and because the program is temporary and of limited duration applying only to 1961 crop production, there is every need to incorporate those provisions which would encourage maximum participation, since there is no way of knowing how much participation we are going to get in the program. Of course, if we do not get compliance, this program will be worth less.

In other words the program must be so attractive that producers would find it difficult to pass up, yet overall costs must be reasonable.

Producers will be alert to recognize that the support level for corn has been increased from \$1.06 to \$1.20 per bushel; thus they may be quick to believe that their returns would be maximized if they did not participate in the voluntary program, but instead produced large quantities of corn and other feed grains in anticipation of a markedly improved market price.

They have assurance that the price is not going to deteriorate more than 15 cents below the support price, in my judgment, under the Senate bill.

But if they believe, as well they might if the required authority reflected in the House bill is granted, that market prices would not reflect the higher support price, and could be significantly lower, there would be further and imperative reasons to participate in the voluntary program. It is important, therefore, that the desire to participate be encouraged to the utmost at the only time it can be effective—prior to planting. Authority for the Department of Agriculture to make feed grain sales in such volume as would prevent market prices from reflecting the new and higher support price would constitute strong and meaningful incentive to participate.

I might add, as the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota stated, the Senate version would be less attractive to farmers than the House version, because it requires that 30 percent of the acreage be taken out, instead of 20 percent with an option to take an additional 20 percent. It is a much more decisive step which has to be taken at a time and under circumstances when the farmers could expect, under the Senate version, that the price for corn is going to be substantial, anyway, and might be close to \$1.20 in the market.

The Senate bill, S. 993, does not provide the kind of incentive required because it would leave unchanged present legislative authority to make sales. It cannot be overemphasized that there must be important benefits under this program which would be available to participants—and which would be withheld from those choosing not to comply.

A high level of participation will assure overall success of this emergency program. It would mean a significant decrease in feed grain production; it nat-

urally follows that the Government thus would be able to liquidate some of its holdings of feed grains. We are all interested in the reduction of Government held stocks, for we all recognize the extent to which the continued carrying by Government of these stocks leads to additional high costs. Further, consumers have an important stake in this program, because the maintenance of market prices at levels lower than support prices will assure them of fair and reasonable prices in their purchases of dairy products, meat and poultry.

The distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], ranking Republican member of the committee, a very able student of agriculture, and one of the outstanding experts in the country on the program, voted against reporting the bill because in his judgment it would make for a cost-price squeeze on dairy farmers. I must say I am reluctant for that very reason, because my farmer constituents are overwhelmingly dairy farmers. I am very much aware of this fact, and therefore I think the House version, so far as it embodies freedom for the Secretary of Agriculture on the question of disposal, would be far better not only for the corn farmers, but also for the dairy farmers, the chicken farmers, and various other consuming farmers.

To summarize, it seems to me that the Senate version would result in a higher, not a lower surplus, and therefore a higher, not a lower cost to the taxpayer; and that the House version would result in more compliance.

Because there will be more compliance, there will be less planting. There will be less production, and a smaller surplus. There will be more use of the commodity surplus clause, and therefore disposal of the Commodity Credit Corporation's stocks.

In the third place, there will be better consumer pricing, as I have said. It will be more beneficial to the dairy farmers and other farmers who are customers of grains.

Furthermore, there is no question in my mind that in the long run the House version, in the respect that I discussed today, would be far better for the feed-producing farmer, because it would mean that his income would be improved. It would be better because I think, if this program were a failure, it might very well result in a situation in which the American people and the Congress, in response to the reaction of the American people, would simply throw the feed grain farmer and the corn farmer to the mercy of the free market, in which case we would have utter disaster, with failures, disasters, and a catastrophic break in farm income.

On the other hand, I think if the program were a success, if we achieved compliance—and the opportunities for compliance are far better under the House version—I think it would be possible for us to advance a program which would reduce the cost to the taxpayers, which would keep the price to the consumer as reasonable and as low as possible, and which provides for a steadily increasing income for the farmer. I say that with

the greatest deference to the distinguished chairman of the committee, who has had a great deal of experience—far more experience than I have had in agriculture—and who has worked so hard and so effectively on the proposed legislation.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I remember that in July of 1958, when the Senate was considering a bill having to do with corn, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] offered an amendment. The effect of that amendment was to give to producers of feed grains a choice like that offered producers of cotton: Either to plant within allotments, which would have reduced feed grain acreage by 20 percent, and receive higher price supports at 85 percent of parity; or to grow all the corn they needed or wished and receive price support at not less than \$1.10 per bushel.

I remember that I voted for his amendment. However, it was defeated. At the time I thought the bill that we passed would result in increased production and an increased surplus. I predicted that corn production would be increased 600 million bushels, and would reach record levels of more than 4 billion bushels a year. Of course, that is what has happened.

I had the opportunity to hear the details of the proposal that was presented to us by the new Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman. I think he is making an effort to reach at least some emergency solution of the problem of overproduction of feed grains. Nevertheless, I believe the amendment which was drawn and which was accepted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is far superior to the bill that was proposed. I say that in no derogation of the purposes of the new Secretary of Agriculture, but chiefly because I would not like to see—and I am not sure many others would like to see—the authority given to the Secretary of Agriculture that was proposed in the bill presented to us—in effect to manipulate the prices of grain.

I assume the purpose of that section, section 3, was to induce cooperation in his program. But I believe it would be a very bad thing to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to lower prices, and to raise prices, of grains, and thus in effect to maneuver market prices.

I believe the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], our committee chairman, who had a great part in writing the bill which is before us, has performed a very valuable service. I believe all committee members did reserve the right to raise questions, and to offer amendments if we decided to do so after the bill had been reported.

I wish to submit some facts for the RECORD. I hope that the distinguished chairman will study these facts, and let me have his views upon them, if not today, at least tomorrow.

It seems to me that the feed grain bill before the Senate is similar in many ways to the acreage reserve of the soil bank, which was in effect in 1956, 1957, and 1958. The acreage reserve was ended because, while the reduction of crop



acreage by participating farmers was excellent, the total production of corn continued to increase.

Under the acreage reserve any farmer having a corn allotment could put his entire allotment into the soil bank. The proposal before us permits the farmer to put only 30 percent of his acreage into this temporary land retirement program. I am deeply concerned that this plan will work, but I do not think anyone can say that it is certain to succeed.

When we consider the experience of the soil bank, under which the entire acreage allotment could be placed into reserve, I think we must consider whether this plan, which would permit only 30 percent of a farmer's feed grain acreage to be placed in reserve, would work.

Senators interested in reviewing the experience under the corn soil bank may wish to read the comparison prepared at my request by the Department of Agriculture, which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 28, on pages 2818-2820.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a table, which contains the latest information I could secure, from the last census of agriculture, showing the acres of corn harvested for all purposes. This table shows the situation several years ago, I must admit, but I assume the relationships have not changed much. The table shows that in 1954 there were 2,844,369 farms which produced corn, and that more than half of those farms harvested less than 15 acres of corn.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1954 Census of Agriculture—Acres harvested for all purposes, corn

	U.S. farms	Kentucky farms
Harvested corn.....	2,855,001	137,074
Under 3 acres.....	240,193	22,597
3 or 4 acres.....	276,021	20,743
5 to 10 acres.....	706,390	41,677
11 to 15 acres.....	323,477	16,104
16 to 19 acres.....	132,250	5,955
20 to 24 acres.....	190,824	7,941
25 to 49 acres.....	484,174	15,035
50 to 74 acres.....	250,035	4,198
75 to 99 acres.....	116,895	1,374
100 to 149 acres.....	93,060	970
150 to 199 acres.....	24,717	231
200 to 299 acres.....	12,640	178
300 to 399 acres.....	2,680	31
400 to 499 acres.....	918	27
500 or more.....	727	13

<sup>1</sup> Harvested corn 1950, 2,144,036 farms.

Mr. COOPER. The question I raise is this: Would it be proper for farmers who raise 15 or fewer acres of corn to enter into a program under which the acreage they could place in retirement or in the reserve would be limited to only 30 percent of that amount—in other words, 4½ acres? I believe there must be a greater practical inducement to bring small farmers into this program.

I give an example to show what happened under the soil bank, which was well accepted by farmers producing corn. I have these figures from my own State. In 1958, 79,411 Kentucky farms had corn allotments totaling 930,550 acres. The average corn allotment was less than 12

acres; 23,023 farmers, having 330,267 allotted acres, agreed to join the corn soil bank, and they put 315,457 corn acres into the program. Therefore, nearly every farmer who participated put his entire allotment into the program, and grew no corn.

Mr. President, if this program could not succeed with these farmers putting their entire allotment into the plan, I believe we must consider whether a program which would permit them to put only 30 percent of their production into the plan would succeed.

Many farmers, especially those outside the Corn Belt, have small acreages of feed grains. If small farmers are not permitted to put their entire feed grain acreage into the program, it will result, I believe, in lower participation, a great burden of administrative work to determine that no less and no more than 30 percent of the land is retired and paid for, and little or no effect in reducing feed grain production.

I wish to offer an amendment which I would like the chairman, and other members of the committee, to consider. I would like to have all Senators who are interested in reducing feed grain production consider the amendment.

The effect of my amendment would be to permit any farmer to put into the retirement program as much as 30 acres of feed grains. I submit the amendment on the basis of the figures I have presented, which show that about one-half of all the farmers in the United States produced less than 15 acres of corn. In these circumstances, we might get a much larger participation if the farmers on small farms were permitted to take out of production the entire corn acreage on those small farms.

I hope the chairman of the committee will take this amendment into consideration. We can discuss it further tomorrow.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what the program is in connection with the pending bill. I wish to speak for about 15 minutes, and possibly as long as 20 minutes, on the agricultural situation in general, with particular reference to the bill which is before the Senate today.

I have already submitted an amendment which would, I believe, go a considerable distance toward making up to the dairy people the additional cost which the bill now before the Senate would impose upon them, at a time when they can hardly afford to incur this additional cost.

I note there are very few Senators in the Chamber this evening. It is a quarter to 5. I wonder whether we could bring Senators to the Chamber by a quorum call. It might be that they would not be in a very good mood if we called them now. I was wondering if the debate could go over until tomorrow. I understand that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] has a few questions to ask.

Mr. ELLENDER. I believe it was decided earlier in the afternoon that the bill would go over until tomorrow, and that no action would be taken on the bill

tonight. I had proposed delaying action on the bill until we see the House bill.

Mr. AIKEN. That is advisable. The chairman is showing good judgment.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am sure the House bill will not come to us this afternoon. Therefore, consideration of the bill can go over until tomorrow. I am reasonably certain that the bill will be with us then, and we can dispose of it later, in a matter of hours, I hope.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not know of any protracted discussion which is expected to take place on the floor of the Senate. I only wished to make sure that further discussion would not be prevented, because I have a few remarks to make, which I would rather make in the morning than at this time.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have just been informed that the House will probably adjourn until tomorrow without passing the bill today. Therefore, there will be ample time to make speeches on it tomorrow.

Mr. AIKEN. I understand the House is considering some amendments. I do not know what the House intends to do with them. Of course under our rules we cannot discuss the action of the other House, or what it plans to do. However, I would be very much surprised if the House finished action on the bill tonight. From what I have heard, I am sure it will not finish action on it tonight.

Mr. ELLENDER. My information now is that the House will not pass the bill today.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Colorado has some remarks to make. Does the Senator wish to ask some questions of me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I had some remarks to make, and I also wish to ask some questions.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk. It deals with the pending bill. I ask that it may be printed and lie on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, there is no question about the fact that the whole farm problem is one of the major problems that we must solve. I have studied the bill now before the Senate, and I must say that if we are to act, as the chairman of the committee suggested earlier today, we must act quickly in order to get the program into effect this year.

My own remarks now are by way of raising some questions, which I hope will be answered either now or in the further course of the debate. They give me real concern.

I believe it is a generally accepted theory among stockmen and farmers in general that low grain prices tend to produce low stock prices. I am not sure that this is always true, although most people would say that that statement is most axiomatic. The question that bothers me is this: If we have a program of this sort, how is it going to affect stock prices? In other words, if this program, as I envision it, would mean that the second half of the reduced pro-

portion would be a payment in kind, and would tend to release small grains from storage, from the Commodity Credit Corporation, how would it affect the price of livestock?

If we consider the ordinary consumer, it will mean a reduction in the price of livestock. However, we must look further than that, because with respect to the great cattle and sheep areas, we must divide those areas into two parts. We must recognize, first of all, that the man who is a feeder, who puts the cattle on the market, is rarely to any great extent the man who is the breeder and the raiser. So there are these two elements in the agricultural economy which to some extent seem to me to have opposite interests.

For example, if the price of general grains go down as a result of a great many of these feed grains coming out of stock—and we assume that there would be a consequent reduction in the price of beef—then, while from the standpoint of the consumer this would seem to be fine for the moment, we must realize that we must carry this cycle one step further.

The next step from there is that if the feeder is to put his livestock on the market at a lower price, it means that he will either underestimate or receive less profits for those years, and the next year, when he goes on the market to buy what are known in the trade as feeders or young cattle or steers for feeding, he will of necessity have to buy them at a lower price. There will not be the bidders for them.

The secondary effect will be that the price of feeders will be lower. When that occurs, I think it is almost axiomatic that if the price of feeders is decreased, the interest in this particular segment of the stock industry is decreased; and by decreasing the interest in the stock industry, a shortage in feeders is brought about within a year or so. In the interim, many breeders and livestock raisers may have been forced out of business.

So at the end of the first or second year, as a secondary effect, it will suddenly be found that very few feeders are on the market, not so many cattle are being raised, and therefore those which are on the market will sell at a higher price. Therefore, the feeder will pay a higher price; and in paying a higher price, he will dispose of his stock to the public at a higher price. So we shall be right back at the place where we started, except that, by inference, in this cycle, in the balance, we may actually have created, in the long run, an increase in the price of livestock for public consumption.

I have seen this occur during most of my adult life. I do not pretend to know much about the practical aspects of livestock raising or breeding; but having lived in an agricultural community all my adult life, I have seen these things occur over and over again. I believe that what I have just suggested might or could well be the logical outcome of the bill.

I do not wish to detain either the distinguished Senator from Vermont

[Mr. AIKEN] or the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the chairman of the committee, on the floor for any length of time, but there are two or three questions to which I should like to have answers. In my part of the country—and I speak generally for all the Great Plains area in this respect, those areas which are not irrigated, what we call dry land—there are two chief crops which are susceptible of growth in that great portion of that country. The first is wheat. We find that when farmers plant wheat in the fall, and they do not make a crop through the winter, when the snowfall is short, and moisture is short, very often, in the spring, in early June or the latter part of May, they will plow up the wheat and plant sorghums, maizes, milo, and things like that, which are feed crops.

I will direct my first question to the distinguished Senator from Vermont, since I asked him to remain in the Chamber, and ask what he thinks the effect of the bill would be upon the growing or production of sorghum crops in my part of the country. Those farmers have produced certain amounts of grains, sometimes large amounts, sometimes small amounts. They would be pinned down to a 2-year average, as I understand the bill.

If they had grown good wheat crops in the past 2 years, and they might not have grown any of the feed grains, what would be the effect on the farmers of the Great Plains area?

Mr. AIKEN. So far as I am concerned, I will not attempt to read the minds of the farmers of the Great Plains area at this point. It is a good question for discussion as to whether they would participate in the program and have the benefits which would be almost as much in income as they would get from producing a crop, or might choose not to go into the program but would raise grains for feed.

At the beginning of his remarks, the Senator from Colorado raised a very interesting question; namely, the effect of feed prices on the production of meats. I can give him an example of that.

In 1958, Congress enacted new corn legislation, which has been in effect for 2 years. As a result of that legislation, some say, or as a result of exceptionally good corn-growing weather, others say, there has been an increase in the corn crop and an increase in the production of sorghum, as well. That has not, however, resulted in an increase in meat production per capita.

As of January 1, 1961, the number of cattle in the Nation was up 1 percent from the year before. The number of hogs was down 6 percent. The number of sheep was down 1 percent. The amount of poultry was down 3 percent.

It is quite apparent now that despite the lower price for grain and the support for corn, which has dropped from \$1.12 a bushel a year ago to \$1.06, as a result of the large supply which is on hand, the per capita supply of meats available in this country throughout 1961 will be somewhat less than it was in 1960.

The Senator from Colorado can judge the reason for that as well as I can. I would assume that, even at present support levels, perhaps it was found more profitable to turn the grain over to the Government than to produce meat. It might have been due to labor situations or to any number of other things. But the main thing is that the per capita supply of meat is down from that of last year. That is quite disturbing.

The Senator wants to know what would be the effect of raising the price of corn and the corresponding price of sorghum, and other feeds from their present levels—from \$1.06, for corn, to \$1.20. Would it result in more or less feed? I can answer that question very truthfully: I do not know. I cannot read the minds of the feeders in his part of the country. Sometimes they do exactly the opposite of what we anticipate they might do when we are working on proposed legislation. Certainly, the per capita supply of meat has dropped since the price of grain went down.

Mr. ALLOTT. I pose a further question. This is one thing which has always concerned me about payments in kind. As I understand the bill, the payments in kind must be taken out of the elevator. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. AIKEN. Out of storage.

Mr. ELLENDER. Owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ALLOTT. Owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. They would have to be taken out of storage.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. This raises the very interesting, though I think pertinent, question as to whether taking these stocks out of storage and putting them, in effect, on the market, would cause a depression of the grain prices, and would, in effect, lower grain prices and set in motion the cycle which I described a few minutes ago, which I think is a fairly true analysis of what may well happen.

Mr. ELLENDER. The committee gave thought to that problem. As I recall, the original bill contained a so-called section 3, which would have given the Secretary of Agriculture a more or less free hand to sell the grain at whatever the market would bring, so as to invite producers of grain to come into the program. I thought that if such a provision were left in the bill, it would certainly demoralize the grain market.

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree with the Senator's statement.

Mr. ELLENDER. It might cause the price of feed grains to go lower. As a general rule, the lowering of feed grain prices might cause more people to go into the chicken business. I do not believe that the number of livestock would increase greatly, because, as the Senator knows, 2 to 3 years are required to raise cattle for the market, whereas in the case of chickens, they can be produced in a matter of 8 to 10 weeks.

But I would have little fear of the effect on the market by virtue of withdrawing the grain for payment in kind,



because the trade will know within a few months after the program is underway—

Mr. ALLOTT. Possibly by the first of June or July?

Mr. ELLENDER. Exactly—almost to the bushel how much will be withdrawn, because, as I have said, the bill provides for half of the reduction being paid for in kind and the other half in cash. The fact that the grain trade will know about how much will be withdrawn will mean that they can determine how much effect that will have on the market; and I do not believe the market will fluctuate too much.

So we may have a more or less steady price for grain, in contrast to what would happen if section 3 remained in the bill—thus giving the Secretary authority simply to put it on the market, in order to get the producers to participate. That was one of the objections which was raised by several members of the committee. After canvassing around, I thought that if a bill on the subject were to be enacted into law, it would be best to eliminate that provision, and in lieu thereof to have a program providing for payment in kind and in cash, but making it obligatory, rather than optional, as was the case under the original bill that the in-kind part of the payment actually be taken in kind.

Mr. ALLOTT. I may say that the chairman's analysis of what would happen under section 3 coincides with my own feeling about it. I have always felt that if we arranged for payments in kind, we might be arranging for something which we had not quite figured out, and they might possibly have an impact which we do not now anticipate.

Mr. ELLENDER. But on those acres they will not be producing any feed grain; and to the extent that there is a total reduction of acres, there will, in my opinion, be a decrease in the supply. That is the purpose of the bill; it is to divert acres from the production of grain, so our enormous surpluses can be reduced. It is figured out that if the present program were permitted to continue as it has in the past, without any new law this year, we would increase our grain supply by from 500 million to 750 million bushels. If we added all that to what we already have, there would be no telling what would happen. A good many of us believe that unless something is done in regard to corn and other feed grains and wheat, the entire support-price program may be in jeopardy. That was one of the reasons why we were so anxious to submit a bill which would be fairly acceptable—I do not mean to say that the acceptance would be unanimous, but more acceptable than the bill submitted by the administration.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate the answer given by the distinguished chairman of the committee; and I agree that we have to go into this whole thing.

On the other hand, I would feel that I had not quite done my job if I had not raised some of these questions, which I believe will come to us in the future.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President—

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to say to the Senator from Colorado that I do not think anyone can forecast with any degree of accuracy what might be the effect on the feed market of putting the payments in kind on the market. Theoretically, when a farmer reduced his production 1 acre, he would be paid half in cash and half in kind. Therefore, a bushel of wheat which was paid to him in kind would be half the theoretical reduction of his production. Actually, however, that would not be so, because, as the Senator from Colorado knows, if a farmer had one acre which produced 15 bushels to the acre and had another acre which produced 45 bushels to the acre, and if his average thus was 30 bushels an acre, there would be no doubt about which acre he would put into the soil bank.

Therefore, when an amount equal to his average production times half of his half of his retired acreage is taken from Government storage and placed on the market and his actual production also reaches there, the amount on the market would be just about what it was before.

So I do not think we can tell what would be the effect of taking the payment in kind out of storage and putting it on the market, unless we know just what kind of acres will go into the soil bank, because I know that the farmers in Vermont—and I do not think the farmers in Colorado or in Nebraska or in any other State are any different—would not put their best acres in.

If the law were changed, so as to put the sales on a bushel basis, instead of on an acreage-planted basis, it might be possible to have enough control, so that the grain taken out of the elevators would not have a depressing effect on the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. But let me point out that the payment in kind is to be made on the basis of average production on the farm.

Mr. AIKEN. That is right.

Mr. ELLENDER. And he will receive payment in kind at a rate equal in value to 60 percent of the support price.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes, the monetary value of the certificate would be based on 60 percent of the support price, which would place even more feed grains on the market.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understand. But I do not believe that the only advantage to the farmers would be to select any particular acreage, because what they have done in the past, in order to bring about the enormous increase, has been to use more fertilizer and better seed. That is really the principal reason for the enormous increase—as I pointed out in my earlier statement today.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to say to the distinguished chairman of the committee that I think it does have some effect, and I would agree with the Senator from Vermont. Although the payments are to be based on the average production, I think we can assume that in view of man's desire to make the most out of whatever he has—and what is true of any other business is also true of the farmers, business—the least profitable acres will be

taken out of production, and the acres left in production will be the most productive ones.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield to me?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. I thank the Senator from Colorado. I should like to have him yield so that I may propound a question to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield for that purpose, Mr. President, if I may do so without losing the floor. I so request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. In reference to the payment in kind, will the farmer have to take it in kind?

Mr. ELLENDER. No. That is to say, he will be able to do one of two things. I explained how the certificates would be issued.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. And I explained that the value placed on them would be based on the price support provided by this bill. Then when the producer goes to cash in, he can go to the Commodity Credit Corporation and can say, "I want so many bushels of No. 1 grain"—or of No. 2 grain or of No. 3 grain, or a combination of all—"for the value of this certificate." Then he can withdraw it. But if he does not want to do that, he can have the Commodity Credit Corporation help him sell the certificate so that he can get its value in cash.

Mr. CURTIS. He will have to wait until the sale takes place, will he?

Mr. ELLENDER. He can withdraw the grain at any time. Furthermore, withdrawal must be made within 60 days, or he will have to bear the carrying charges.

Mr. CURTIS. Yes. But suppose the transaction is entirely a paper one. When he is entitled to his payment in kind, suppose he gets his certificate and presents it to the Commodity Credit Corporation, and suppose that what he wants is dollars. Does the Commodity Credit Corporation then sell, from its stocks, sufficient corn to be able to give him the dollars to which he is entitled; and if so, at what price?

Mr. ELLENDER. The market price, in effect. The value of the certificate, as I pointed out in my main presentation, is based on the current support price, which would be \$1.20. The Commodity Credit Corporation would help the producer sell his certificate to someone who would use it to obtain feed grains from the Corporation at their market value in redemption of the certificate. It is essentially the same as a sale at market price. The producer would receive the cash and the purchaser of the certificate would receive the grain in return for paying the market price.

Mr. CURTIS. To that extent, then, the Commodity Credit Corporation will be selling grain at less than 105 percent of the support price.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is right; the grains would move at the market price at the time of the sale.

Mr. CURTIS. What does the Senator anticipate will be the effect of that on the market price?

Mr. ELLENDER. I do not think it will have any great effect, for this reason: The market as a whole will not be taken by surprise, because it will be possible to estimate the amount of grain that will be moved under this in-kind-payment program. It will be fixed in advance. Just as soon as the program is put into effect, the Secretary of Agriculture will be able to make a determination of how much grain will be moved within a given period. Because of this, the trade will know what will happen, and, therefore, there will be no material effect on the market price.

As I pointed out a while ago, if the Secretary of Agriculture were permitted to sell any amount at any time—

Mr. CURTIS. Such as was originally proposed?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; I can see the effect it would have on the market. It would have a drastic effect on the market. The price might be brought down to nil.

Mr. CURTIS. I am sure the distinguished chairman of the committee adheres to the philosophy that the purpose of a farm program is to raise prices the farmers receive for what they sell, and not to raise their income by other methods, insofar as possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. The economists from the Department ascertained that if the program as proposed in the Senate bill goes through, it will increase farm income from 6 to perhaps as much as 8 percent over what the income would be under the present program.

Mr. CURTIS. Is that the total farm income in the United States or the income of the individual producing the grain?

Mr. ELLENDER. Over what the income would be under the present corn and feed-grains program.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the Senator talking about the farmer who produces corn and other feed grains?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. We will assume he sells it all or takes a Government program on it.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let us say that a farmer who produced corn and other feed grains last year will produce the same this year. If he took advantage of the bill we are proposing and curtailed his production to the extent of, say, 30 percent, and if there were as much as 70 percent compliance, the average such farmer would receive an income of from 6 to 8 percent greater than he would under the present law.

It is estimated that if the plan submitted by the administration were put into effect, the income would rise probably from 8 to 12 percent, as I remember the figures. The increase would be a little greater.

Mr. CURTIS. But it would not rise through a higher market price; it would rise through a higher Government expenditure. Is that correct?

Mr. ELLENDER. Both; it would rise because the farmer would be paid not to produce, and his expenses would be

decreased. Then, the support price is being increased from \$1.06 for 1960 to \$1.20 for 1961. These factors, added together, would increase the income.

Mr. CURTIS. Distinguishing the original proposal as it came from the administration from the chairman's bill, did I correctly understand the original proposal would raise the farmer's income a little more?

Mr. ELLENDER. A little more; yes.

Mr. CURTIS. But that increased income would be arrived at to a less extent through a greater price at which he sold his products, and more through Government assistance?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I should like to return to that part of the discussion which I had before I yielded to the Senator from Nebraska, with respect particularly to the effect the bill would have on the farmers of the Great Plains area.

As the chairman of the committee well knows, 1959 and 1960 were very good years throughout the Great Plains area. As a result, there is less compulsion or necessity to grow sorghum or feed grains in that area, keeping in mind that in the upper plains areas, except in the irrigated sections, these are the only other crops that can be grown.

Do I correctly understand the bill to provide that if in this year, for example, a farmer went through the winter and found his wheat crop was a complete failure which did not justify his harvesting in July, he would be limited, in any participation in this program, to grains he had grown in 1959 and 1960?

Mr. ELLENDER. Did the Senator say he planted wheat?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am assuming he planted wheat.

Mr. ELLENDER. As the Senator knows, this is not a compulsory program, and, of course, if the farmer to whom the Senator has referred planted wheat, and not corn, he would not be affected, because it is only the producer of corn and other feed grains who would come within the purview of the act.

Mr. ALLOTT. I am fully cognizant of that fact. Perhaps I have not explained adequately to the chairman the situation which actually exists, and which is a little difficult to understand. I am sure the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from South Dakota, who are present in the Chamber, understand the situation. In a great portion of the Great Plains area, sorghums and milos are the only crops that can be grown as alternatives to wheat. As a result, a great deal of milo, maize and sorghums is grown, not for their value alone, but also as a result of inability to grow wheat, as, for example, when the farmers go through a dry winter.

In all that part of the country to which I refer, there were 2 wonderful years, which were almost ideal for the production of wheat. I think through that area the production of wheat in 1959 and 1960 was the highest it has ever been.

That being the case, if, during the winter of 1961, the farmers find they would like to participate in the grain program, not having grown any particular grains as substitutes for wheat in

1959 and 1960, because they were doing all right with their wheat crop, would they be confined entirely to the historical production in 1959 and 1960, which was, as a consequence, in the instance of many individual farmers, low?

Mr. ELLENDER. Of course, almost the same language is included in other legislation. Under the bill the Secretary could prescribe certain rules and regulations covering conditions to which the Senator refers. If the Senator will look at page 6 of the bill he will find the language:

In accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary, the acreage of corn, grain sorghums, other feed grains designated by the Secretary, and other nonconserving crops for harvest in 1959 and 1960 may be adjusted to the extent the Secretary determines appropriate for abnormal weather conditions, established crop rotation practices for the farm, changes in the constitution of the farm, participation in soil bank or Great Plains programs, or to give effect to the provisions of law relating to release and reapportionment or preservation of history, and such other factors as the Secretary may deem appropriate.

We tried to cover that situation as well as we could.

Mr. ALLOTT. For legislative history, when there is a very dry winter, such as this winter in many areas, the language which the chairman has read, on page 6 beginning at line 11, would enable the Secretary to make necessary adjustments so that these farmers could grow sorghums, maize, and so on, and voluntarily come under the program?

Mr. ELLENDER. That is correct. He has authority to make such adjustments if he believes them to be necessary.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me on that point?

Mr. ALLOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The agreement reached in the colloquy with the chairman of the committee is substantiated and underscored in two ways. The first is to be seen at the bottom of page 7, starting with line 21, in the language:

For the purposes of this subsection the average annual yield of each commodity shall be the average annual yield per harvested acre on the farm for the years 1959 and 1960, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions and other factors as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

I have in my hand a copy of the regulations prescribed by the Secretary in the Feed Grain Farm Survey Handbook, part 3, paragraph 13 of which subhead reads as follows:

Indicating Reasons for Abnormal Planting.

These are the instructions which the county committees will receive. They in turn, have to forward through channels to the Secretary of Agriculture their recommendations as to what should comprise abnormal weather conditions and abnormal planting.

It says:

The county representative should also enter in available space on the acreage report from the reason(s), if any, given by the producer—

The man we are talking about, who has practiced a little different type of



farming operation in a good year from what he practices in a normal year—

why a feed grain acreage should be considered abnormal and therefore not representative for the respective year. This information is important and will be considered in the establishment of a normal base acreage for the farm.

It seems to me that any valid and sensible interpretation of that language would certainly have to relate itself to the peculiar and unique conditions which the Senator described in his question to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. ALLOTT. Does the Senator agree that the same conditions I have described as being applicable to a great portion of the Great Plains area are applicable to a considerable portion of the Senator's State?

Mr. MUNDT. Yes. In certain segregated counties of South Dakota—I am sure this is probably also true in Colorado, and undoubtedly true in North Dakota, I say to the Senator from North Dakota, who is in attendance—the opposite has occurred. The reverse situation exists, since we have had a small drought in certain segregated areas.

I should like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee for a moment, to have his further assurance that the formula will work in both directions. I have in my hand a letter which came to my office today from the office manager of the ASC committee for Grant County, Mr. A. J. Pufahl, who describes a condition prevailing in one or two counties of the State. I am sure this condition prevails in the general area of North Dakota, Minnesota, Montana, and Colorado, which have erratic seasons and erratic production. He points out that he has been filling out a recommendation, which he encloses, to go through channels to the Secretary of Agriculture. He says:

The attached feed grain acreage report for a sample farm assuming the same acreages were seeded both 1959 and 1960 shows what would happen to many South Dakota and Grant County farms in the 1959 crop year if the county ASC committee would not be able to adjust the figures on oats and barley that were cut for hay or failed that year. There are, of course, areas in the United States where oats, etc., for hay is a normal practice which should not be included in the feed grains.

The year 1959 was the first year since 1936 in Grant County when the drought situation existed.

You can see what would happen to many Grant County farmers if the failed acreages of barley and oats were not included in the grain figures. These farmers suffered loss of crops in 1959 and would again sustain a loss in 1961 if they participated in the program. It would be a factor also in program participation and in obtaining the necessary reduction of feed grains expected in this program.

I should like to have for the RECORD from the chairman of the committee a further assurance. I am sure it will be forthcoming, because it is our complete understanding as to the way the proposed legislation is written, which is borne out by the section which I have quoted in the instructions to the county committeemen, taken from paragraph 13 of the Department of Agriculture instructions.

When there are short crops as a result of an unusual drought in the years 1959 and 1960 this authority, which was cited by the chairman in response to the interrogation by the Senator from Colorado, would also operate to instruct the county committeemen in such counties to adjust the normal acreage upward to compensate for the unexpected and extraordinarily bad years.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is my interpretation. That is the purpose of the language, to give the Secretary the authority to make such adjustments as he believed necessary.

Mr. MUNDT. We put the language in the bill in two different places. It is not only in the section cited by the chairman, page 6, lines 11 through 23, but also on page 7, lines 21 through 25.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MUNDT. It is as clear as the English language can make it that the county committees would be expected to adjust the acreage allotments in terms of abnormal seasons, whether in the case cited by the Senator from Colorado, in which it would appear there were unusually good years which resulted in abnormal crop arrangements, or in a case such as the one I made reference to, in Grant County, where there was abnormally low production because of a temporary and unusual drought which hit certain isolated counties in the State.

Mr. ALLOTT. I appreciate very much the questioning of the distinguished chairman of the committee by the Senator, and the answers by the chairman, because it seems to me with this colloquy we have created a legislative history on the bill which can be very important to Colorado and to other States. I would not have consumed all of this time had it been important only for Colorado, but the same applies to Texas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, South Dakota, North Dakota, Wyoming, and even Montana.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should like to give credit to my good friend from South Dakota for bringing all that up before the committee. The Senator was instrumental in having the language put in the bill, and I believe it was really copied from previous legislation, because the Senator referred to previous legislation and stated he felt something along the same line should be incorporated in this bill.

Mr. MUNDT. The chairman is correct. I know the chairman, who did a splendid and constructive job in improving the language as it first came from the Department and as it appears in the House bill, agrees that normally if we had written such legislation under ordinary conditions we would have provided for a period of several years in order to obtain averages. Since this is emergency legislation we must act promptly, if at all, in order to be helpful for the crop year which is now upon us. We did the best we could, then put the explanatory language in the bill and in the report, and it is now in the colloquy as a part of the legislative history in regard to the bill.

I am completely confident that no Department of Agriculture executive could operate honestly and accurately in defiance of what is the clear intention of the Congress to meet these conditions.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank my good friend from South Dakota, who has been of great help in this matter.

Mr. HRUSKA rose.

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for the purpose of my asking a question in the same area?

Mr. ALLOTT. I yield.

Mr. HRUSKA. As I understood the situation, as outlined by the Senator from Colorado, and also the situation as outlined by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], their inquiries pertain to an area in which there was either a drought, overplanting, or underplanting of sorghums, particularly. I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry whether, under the language of the statute, that same discretion and that same ability to adjust the situation would extend to situations in which farmers have been carrying out programs of good soil management by way of crop rotation and where they have taken out of production for that purpose acreage, and who, except for such language as is found in the statute, would be penalized thereby because the base is only for 1959 and 1960 and for no other year. The language of the bill does include, as read in part by the chairman, established crop rotation practices for the farmer. Is it in the contemplation of that statutory language that the situation that I referred to would also be taken into consideration?

Mr. ELLENDER. I presume so. The idea we had in mind was to treat everyone fairly and to take into consideration normal conditions; and it strikes me, as the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] pointed out, that the Secretary would have ample authority to deal with the problem to the extent of bringing matters in focus as to normal conditions. That is the purpose.

Mr. HRUSKA. It is the purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. We raised the point with respect to going back 3, 4, or 5 years, as the Senator pointed out. We were given to understand that it would require too long time to obtain the facts as to each farm, and that in many instances it would be more or less guesswork. I believe that the bill contains the best solution to the problem that is now under discussion.

Mr. MUNDT. I believe there is further assurance that what the chairman says will eventuate, by the fact that in paragraph 13 of the instruction sheets to the county chairmen that I quoted, they are asked to secure from the producer any deviations which may exist from the fact that 1959 and 1960 might have been normal years. He is asked to write in, in a specified place in the blank, why he believes there is some deviation from the normal. That is about as far as one can go. We must have some starting point. Obviously, if we could have a 5- or 10-year span, we could work the problem out mathe-

matically. But the bill simply selects 1959 and 1960 as target areas, because if there were normal conditions in a crop, there is a mathematical base from which to operate. If they were not normal, the office is asked to solicit from the producer his estimate of what would be normal, and what his reasons are for the abnormality of the crop.

The committee was asked to take those factors into consideration in their recommendation. It seems to me that it is a pretty clear-cut guarantee that they will meet conditions of that type.

Mr. HRUSKA. But that provision refers only to climatic conditions; it would not refer to a situation in which there would be an abuse by one farmer in overplanting, and in that case contributing to the surplus. His base for 1959 and 1960 would then be high. Therefore his reduction would be relatively low.

Compare that condition with the situation of the conscientious farmer who would not overplant and who would not abuse the situation. He carries out in a normal fashion good soil management practices. He carries out the idea of rotating crops and keeping them out of production. He is doing something that is perfectly normal in a good soil management program. Such activity on his part would mean that his base for 1959 and 1960 would be low. Therefore his production under the proposed program would be low.

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot see that what the Senator from Nebraska describes would have particular bearing on the target year of 1959 and 1960, except in the case of a first offender. If he is chronically a good farmer, and chronically and traditionally practices good conservation procedures, he would find himself in the same situation if we should extend the averages from 1955 and 1956, and have 5 or 6 years instead of 1.

Mr. HRUSKA. Except that prior to 1959 he would have had unlimited production of corn, for example. It was at that time that we started unlimited acreage production.

Mr. MUNDT. To all intents and purposes, however, throughout the country the percentage of compliers, if I remember correctly, was 8 or 10 percent who cooperated; so we virtually had unlimited production in 90 percent of the cases.

Mr. ELLENDER. To go further into the problem raised by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], it would be almost impossible to deal specifically in the bill with the problem as he states it. I do not believe that anyone has the capability of drafting legislation that would apply to all conditions. It might be unfortunate for the farmer who followed good practices in soil conservation to be at a disadvantage in contrast to the man who planted from fence to fence, because he had the opportunity to do so. How that situation could be covered I do not know. But it is safe to say that the language in the measure provides wide discretion for the Secretary of Agriculture to make adjustments.

I ask the Senator from Nebraska not to forget that the bill is more or less

a crash program and is limited to 1 year, and the reason for it is to try to reduce the enormous surpluses that we now have on hand and not further to aggravate them. That is the purpose of the measure.

Mr. HRUSKA. It seems to me that the language of the bill is really a delusion. It is quite deceitful in that it refers to the fact that the acreage of corn may be adjusted to the extent that the Secretary determines appropriate for established crop-rotation purposes for the farm, and I do not think it means a thing. It cannot mean a thing, particularly in view of the fact that the time element is so short. It is now March 8. It will be very, very short in respect to the planting that will have to start, and it will take a little while to issue regulations and make determinations. I do not think it means a blooming thing.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I will conclude in a moment. There is one other provision which I had hoped would be included in the bill. No other possible time could be as appropriate as the present to take care of that situation, as we try to determine what the average yield or the average production is. I have been convinced for many years that there will never be any meaningful control of crop production until such time as it is done on a bushelage basis or on some other unit basis.

Members of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry have told me over and over again that this cannot be done. I would be very happy to hear from them as to why it cannot be done.

The obvious fact is that, no matter what bill we pass, we will be faced constantly with increasing production as long as we are getting better types of feed, as long as we are getting better fertilizers, and as long as we are applying better ways of farming.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I have taken the time to study the provisions of these two measures, the House bill and the Senate bill. In many respects they embody provisions which are nearly enough alike as not to constitute problems.

The point about which I am concerned is that dealing with providing the Department of Agriculture with authority to sell feed grains, corn and grain sorghums, at prices below the support level during the 1961 marketing year for these feed grains. The Senate version does not contain this authority—the House bill does, and in a manner that provides a suitable safeguard to insure reasonable stability of market prices.

What the House bill does on this point is to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell corn or grain sorghums during the 1961 marketing year at a price no lower than 83 percent of the support price. If corn is to be supported at \$1.20 a bushel as contemplated, this means a selling price of about \$1. Because the Senate bill does not include a provision of this kind, CCC in its sales operations must of course rely upon present provisions of law—in the case of feed grains this

means that sales it makes must be at a price level which would not substantially impair any price support program. I recognize what the Congress had in mind in enacting the provisions of present law—they simply wanted to protect the price support program in a way which would permit it to work better. What we are discussing today, however, is an emergency feed grain program designed to reduce 1961 production. The program will be completely voluntary, with each individual producer having the opportunity to make his own decision; planting time is almost upon us and there just wouldn't be an opportunity to submit a program of this kind for a vote of all producers. Any producer who cooperates in this emergency program, however, by reducing the 1961 feed grain acreage, can be assured of the support price through the loan program. And it is the cooperators' production that we all are interested in supporting—not the production of those who choose not to participate. One of the important things that this sales authority included in the House bill will do is to make it clear that noncompliers will not have a "free ride" by taking advantage of market prices which might be close to support prices, but at the same time will not have contributed to the success of the program by voluntarily agreeing to reduce their production.

I would prefer the adoption of the House measure, including section 3 which relates to the sales authority I have been discussing. It is my conviction that this measure will markedly increase participation in the program, will provide full price support benefits to compliers, will deny such full benefits to noncompliers, and will enable CCC to move into consumption uses some of its feed grain supplies now held in Government storage. Nevertheless, I shall support this legislation, as our best chance to pass legislation in this area, in the Senate.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], should be complimented for moving the feed grain bill as rapidly and as wisely as he has. I know that we get advice from many distinguished agricultural economists, and that advice is always welcome.

However, it occurs to me that Senators might enjoy, as certainly I did, an expression from a source which we always talk about but not always listen to, the grassroots. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written to me on the feed grain problem, by Mr. Stanley Vorce, of Cross Village, Mich., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 2, 1961.

HON. PHILIP A. HART,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: I have just returned from an ASC district meeting on feed grains (held at Mio). The opinion of most farmers' committeemen I talked to was favorable for this program; of course one runs into a few who are skeptic of any Government help.



There were about 40 committeemen there—that would give a good average for the northern part of lower Michigan. I personally have long thought something that would reduce the acreage of grain in a nongrain area and withdraw it from surplus would help.

Your reports on your approach to agriculture problem are much appreciated and it is heartening to know the farmer has a Secretary who is sympathetic to agriculture.

Respectfully yours,

STANLEY VORCE.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there has been a slight delay in the consideration of the feed grains bill in the other body, and after discussing the subject with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], I should like to bring to the attention of the Senate the possibility that tomorrow, after the morning hour, we may, with the approval of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and the ranking minority member, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], lay aside the feed grains bill temporarily until action has been taken in the House, and in the meanwhile take up the depressed areas bill, on which there will be no vote tomorrow.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. I wonder if the Senator from Montana could throw some light on what he means by a slight delay in the other body. Are they not going to act on the measure today?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my understanding. They have finished debate for today and have gone into special orders, if they have not already adjourned. They will take up the bill tomorrow. They have two or three amendments to consider, and on the basis of what information I can get, which is very tentative, it may be around 4 o'clock or so before they finish consideration of the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Under the suggestion proposed by the majority leader, we could still hope to finish the consideration of the feed grains bill in the Senate tomorrow, could we not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Because, as the Senator from Louisiana said earlier today, time is of the essence on this measure. This is planting time somewhere in America every day, and to make the bill workable with as many people as possible, the sooner we pass upon it—accept or reject it—accept it, I hope—the better the farmers can plan their planting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is absolutely correct. As soon as the House completes action on the bill we will displace the depressed areas bill in the Senate and return to the consideration of the feed grains bill.

The purpose of my statement was to announce to the Senate that there was a strong possibility that this would happen tomorrow. It has been cleared with

the minority leader and with the chairman of the committee and with the ranking minority member of the committee.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 9, 1961, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 8, 1961:

The following-named persons to the offices indicated:

##### FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Philip Elman, of Maryland, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the unexpired term of 7 years from September 26, 1956.

##### ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Martin W. Oettershagen, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation.

##### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Boisfeuillet Jones, of Georgia, to be Special Assistant on Health and Medical Affairs to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

##### FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

Howard Bertach, of Oregon, to be Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration.

##### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

Richard James Murphy, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

Ralph W. Nicholson, of New York, to be an Assistant Postmaster General.

##### UNITED NATIONS

Avery F. Peterson, of Idaho, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 17th session of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

##### DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

J. Graham Parsons, of New York, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Sweden.

Miss Frances E. Willis, of California, a Foreign Service officer of the class of career minister, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon.

Frederick E. Nolting, Jr., of Virginia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Vietnam.

##### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Charles S. Murphy, of Maryland, to be Under Secretary of Agriculture.

Message received from the government of the District of Columbia, March 8, 1961:

##### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Pursuant to the provisions of section 4(a) of Public Law 592, 79th Congress, approved August 2, 1946, the following-named person for reappointment as a member of the Dis-

trict of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency:

Neville Miller, for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1961.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 8, 1961:

##### EXPORT-IMPORT BANK

Charles M. Meriwether, of Alabama, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank of Washington.

##### UNITED NATIONS

Mrs. Gladys A. Tillett, of North Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Commission on the Status of Women of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

##### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Lee Loevinger, of Minnesota, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Robert A. Bicks, resigned.

#### WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate March 8, 1961:

##### FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Earl W. Kintner, of Indiana, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for the term of 7 years from September 26, 1960, which was sent to the Senate on January 10, 1961.

Withdrawal message received from the government of the District of Columbia March 8, 1961:

##### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REDEVELOPMENT LAND AGENCY

Mr. Neville Miller to be a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, to succeed himself for a term of 5 years, effective on and after March 4, 1961, which was sent to the Senate on January 3, 1961. The nomination of Mr. Miller for reappointment as a member of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency was resubmitted by the new Board of Commissioners under date of March 6, 1961.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 8, 1961

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*I Thessalonians 5: 21: Prove all things; hold fast to that which is good.*

O Thou who art the source of all truth and wisdom, of all hope and peace, grant unto us the listening ear and understanding heart as each day Thou dost seek to reveal Thy will and Thy way unto us.

May our faith and our works be fruitful in the service of humanity as it struggles to gain a freer and fuller life.

Fortify us against those moods of doubt and discouragement when the forces of evil seem to impede the progress of our most earnest efforts to establish the kingdom of peace and good will.

Show us how we may help to break down all the walls and barriers of suspicion and selfishness among the nations and let justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream.

Thine be the praise and glory forever. Amen.